The Journal of Historical Review

THIS ISSUE

The Problem of The "Gas Chambers"

In The Matter of Robert Faurisson

Human Soap

Letter From Berlin

The Mendacity of Zion

Letters To The "New Statesman"

Auschwitz Notebook

ALSO

Book Reviews

Revisionist Announcements

Volume One, Number Two *Summer 1980*

The Journal of Historical Review

Volume One, Number Two **Summer 1980**

EDITOR
LEWIS BRANDON

ASSISTANT EDITOR
THOMAS J. MARCELLUS

EDITORIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

DR. AUSTIN J. APP
LA SALLE COLLEGE, (Ret.)

JOHN BENNETT
VICTORIAN COUNCIL FOR CIVIL LIBERTIES
Melbourne, Australia

DR. REINHARD K. BUCHNER
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, Long Beach

DR. ARTHUR R. BUTZ
NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY, Evanston

JAMES E. EGOLF
PATRICK HENRY JUNIOR COLLEGE
Monroeville, Alabama

DR. ROBERT FAURISSON
UNIVERSITY OF LYON-2, Lyon, France

DITLIEB FELDERER
Revisionist History Magazine
Taby, Sweden

ROBERT LE FEVRE
RAMPART COLLEGE, Santa Ana

SAMUEL EDWARD KONKIN III
The New Libertarian, Long Beach

DR. MARTIN A. LARSON
The Spotlight, Washington, D.C.

CHARLES LUTTON
SUMMIT COLLEGE, Manitou Springs, Colorado

DR. JAMES J. MARTIN
INSTITUTE FOR HISTORICAL REVIEW

UDO WALENDY
VERLAG FUR VOLKSTUM & ZEITGESCHICHTSFORSCHUNG
Vlotho/Weser, West Germany

DR. ANDREAS R. WESSERLE
MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY, Milwaukee

INSTITUTE FOR HISTORICAL REVIEW
P.O. Box 1306, Torrance, CA. 90505, U.S.A.

CONTENTS

A Note from the Editor 101
Lewis Brandon

The "Problem of the Gas Chambers" 103
Robert Faurisson

In the Matter of Robert Faurisson 115
John Bennett

The Corpse Factory 121
Arthur Ponsonby

Human Soap 131
Richard Harwood & Ditlieb Felderer

Letter from Berlin 141
Otto Kanold with Mark Weber

The Mendacity of Zion 147
Lewis Brandon

Letters to the "New Statesman" 153
Messrs. Butz, Faurisson, Verrall

Winston Spencer Churchill: a Tribute 163
Harry Elmer Barnes

Auschwitz Notebook 169
Ditlieb Felderer

Book Reviews 173
Lewis Brandon

About the Contributors 187

A Note From The Editor

The first issue of THE JOURNAL OF HISTORICAL REVIEW reprinted the speeches given by various noted Revisionist thinkers at the first-ever Revisionist Convention, held at Northrop University in Los Angeles, over Labor Day weekend, 1979. Most of these speakers concentrated on the "Holocaust" and boldly demonstrated its fraudulent nature.

Reaction to the first issue has been very favorable. More and more academics are waking up to this; the greatest academic hoax since Piltdown Man. These academics are encouraged by the high caliber of research which has so far been published in this field. In our second issue, we again focus almost entirely on the "Holocaust." This is partly because there is such a wealth of material badly in need of publication, but also because the issue is a topical, and indeed, a vital one. A Third World War looms ominously on the horizon, and it threatens to engulf the United States yet again. This time around, the theater of conflict appears to be the Middle East, and without a doubt the U.S. will be expected to pitch-in on the side of the Israel entity. One of the main "arguments" put forward for this alliance is that six million Jews were gassed and therefore we all owe it to them to make amends. The intellectual gymnastics of this "reasoning" will be obvious to any thinking person. But there will undoubtedly be many who will be taken in, even though the argument is a total *non sequitur*.

This is where Revisionism of the "Holocaust" comes in. If we are able to demonstrate effectively that six million Jews were not "gassed" but were simply a product of the Zionists' Machiavellian imaginations, then the entire war-mongering strategy will collapse **on its own terms.** This demonstrates the necessity of "Holocaust" Revisionism as a key to avoiding any immediate, Middle East warfare.

But on a longer term basis, we need to have Historical Revisionism over a whole range of 20th Century events, particularly the lead-in to world wars. For **it is only by understanding the real reasons and real nature of warfare, that we will be able to avoid future warfare.**

Therefore, as of the next issue, we will be devoting more of our space to non-"Holocaust" matters than we have done so far. We will cover as wide a range of 20th Century events as possible, in order to gain more insight and understanding of the real reasons behind them. We will still be publishing "Holocaust"-related articles, of course, but they will take up no more than 30 % of each issue. For one thing, there is just so much valuable and unpublished material on this subject; it would be unfair to ignore it. In particular, we will be publishing more articles by the Swedish researcher Ditlieb Felderer. His first-hand researches are astounding.

This broadening of our Revisionist outlook will also be reflected in our 1980 Revisionist Convention, to be held on the first weekend in August, at a different university campus in southern California. The list of speakers will be announced soon, and attendance application forms may be obtained from this office. I look forward to meeting you there.

LEWIS BRANDON
Director: Institute for Historical Review
Editor: THE JOURNAL OF HISTORICAL REVIEW

The "Problem of the Gas Chambers"[1]

ROBERT FAURISSON[2]

"The Tribunal shall not be bound by technical rules of evidence [...]"
(Article 19 of the Statutes of the International Military Tribunal (in reality: the Inter-allied Military Tribunal) at Nürnberg.)

"The Tribunal shall not require proof of facts of common knowledge, but shall take judicial notice thereof [...]"
(Article 21 of the Statutes.)

No one, not even among those individuals who regard the Third Reich with nostalgia, denies the existence of concentration camps under Hitler. Everyone recognizes also that certain camps were equipped with crematory ovens. Instead of being buried, the corpses were reduced to ashes. The repeated occurrence of epidemics made cremation necessary, especially for those who had died of typhus (see the photos of mass graves at Belsen *et cetera*). What is, however, disputed by numerous French, British, American and German authors is the existence of "extermination camps" in Hitler's Germany. This expression is used by history writers to refer to those camps which are supposed to have been equipped with "gas chambers." These "gas chambers" were different from the American gas chambers in that they were allegedly used to kill masses. The victims were allegedly men, women and children who were exterminated because of their race or religion. This is called "genocide." The principal means for carrying out this "genocide" were slaughterhouses for humans called "gas chambers" and the gas employed for this purpose would have been generally Zyklon B (a pesticide based upon prussic or hydrocyanic acid).

The authors who contest the "genocide" claim and the existence of the "gas chambers" are called Revisionists. Their argument runs approximately as follows:

> It suffices for both of these problems ("genocide" and "gas chambers") to apply the customary methods of historical criticism, to see that one is confronted here by two myths which are inseparable. The criminal intentions which are attributed to Hitler have never been proven. As far as the weapon for this crime is concerned, no one has actually seen it. Here one is confronted by an extraordinarily successful war and hate propaganda campaign. History is full of frauds of this kind, beginning with the religious fables of sorcery and witchcraft. What distinguishes our times from earlier epochs is the frightening power of the media and the propaganda *ad nauseam* which is made for what must be called "the hoax of the twentieth century." Let him beware, whoever might after 30 years get the idea to try and expose this hoax. He will learn—depending upon the situation—through imprisonment, fines, assaults and insults. His career can be shattered or endangered. He will be denounced as a Nazi. Either his thesis will be ignored, or else it will be distorted. No country will be more unrelentingly ruthless toward him than West Germany.

Today however, the silence is about to be broken about those men who have dared to write responsibly that Hitler's "gas chambers" (including those of Auschwitz and Maidanek) are only a historical lie.[3] That is a great advance.

But what insults and distortions an Exterminationist historian such as Georges Wellers allowed himself when, more than ten years after Paul Rassinier's death, he decided to expose the minutest part of the arguments of this ex-inmate of a concentration camp who had had the courage to reveal the lie of the "gas chambers" in his writings!

The best way in which a historian may inform himself regarding the actual claims of the disciples of Paul Rassinier is to refer to the work of the American A.R. Butz entitled *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century.*[4]

For my part, I take the liberty of making only a few observations specifically for the serious research-oriented historians.

I call their attention to a paradox. Although the "gas chambers" are, in the view of the official historians, absolutely central to a picture of the Nazi concentration camp system (and furthermore, as proof for the totally perverse and devilish character of the German concentration camps—in comparison to all previous and more recent concentration camps—it ought to be meticulously shown how the Nazis proceeded to invent, construct, and operate these fearsome slaughterhouses for humans), one must be thoroughly astonished that in the impressive bibliography of the concentration camp literature there is not a single book, not a single brochure, not a single article, on the "gas chambers" themselves. One must not be misled by some very promising titles; rather one must ascertain the contents of these writings for oneself. I regard as "official historical writing" those publications which are written about the concentration camps by institutions or foundations which are partly or wholly financed from public funds, such as, for example, in France: the Comité d'Histoire de la Deuxième Guerre Mondiale (Committee for the History of the Second World War) and the Centre de Documentation Juive Contemporaire (Jewish Contemporary Documentation Center), and in Germany (Munich): Institut für Zeitgeschichte (Institute for Contemporary History).

One must wait until page 541 of the thesis by Olga Wormser-Migot on the system of Nazi concentration camps, before one finds a passage about the "gas chambers." However, for the reader there are still three other surprises:

1. The passage in question covers only three pages.
2. It carries the title: "The Problem of the Gas Chambers."
3. The "problem" consists of trying to determine whether the "gas chambers" at Ravensbrück (Germany) and Mauthausen (Austria) really existed; the author comes to the conclusion that they did not exist; however she does not examine the "problem" of the "gas chambers" of Auschwitz or any of the other camps probably because in her mind they do not present a "problem."

At this point, the reader probably wants to know why an analysis which concludes that "gas chambers" did not exist

in certain camps is suddenly discontinued as soon as, for example, Auschwitz is discussed. Why, on one hand, is the critical spirit awakened, and then, on the other hand, is it allowed to collapse into lethargy? After all, as far as the "gas chamber" of Ravensbrück is concerned, we have available lots of points of "evidence" and "undeniable eyewitness accounts" beginning with repeated and extensive eyewitness accounts by Marie-Claude Vaillant-Couturier or Germaine Tillion. It gets even better. Several years after the war, before both British and French tribunals, the camp officials of Ravensbrück (Suhren, Schwarzhuber and Treite) repeatedly confessed to the existence of a "gas chamber" in their camp. They even vaguely described its operation. Eventually they were hanged because of this alleged "gas chamber" or else they committed suicide. The same "confessions" were given prior to their deaths by Ziereis for Mauthausen (Austria) and by Kramer for Struthof-Natzweiler (Alsace).

Today, one can see the alleged "gas chamber" of Struthof-Natzweiler and in the same place one can also read the unbelievable "confession" of Kramer. This "gas chamber" which is designated as an "historical monument" is a complete fraud. The slightest amount of critical spirit will be sufficient to convince oneself that a gassing in this small room, without any sealing whatsoever, would have been a catastrophe for the executioner as well as for the people in the vicinity. In order to make this "gas chamber" (which is guaranteed to be "in its original condition") believable, someone has gone so far as to clumsily knock a hole into the thin wall with a chisel, and thereby break four tiles. The hole was so arranged that Josef Kramer would have dumped through it the mysterious "salts" (about which he could give no further details and which, when mixed with a little water, killed within one minute!). How could salts and water make gas? How could Kramer have prevented the gas from coming back out the hole? How could he see his victims from a hole which would have let him see no more than half the room? How did he ventilate the room before opening the rudimentary door, made from rough-cut lumber? Perhaps one must ask the civil engineering firm in Saint Michel sur Meurthe

(Vosges), which after the war altered the place which today is presented to visitors "in its original condition"?

Even long after the war, prelates, university professors, and some ordinary citizens, gave eyewitness descriptions regarding the terrible reality of the "gas chambers" of Buchenwald and Dachau. With regard to Buchenwald, the "gas chamber" gradually disappeared from the minds of the people who had previously maintained that there was one in this camp.

Dachau

With regard to Dachau, the situation is different. After it had been firmly established—for example by His Eminence Bishop Piguet, the bishop of Clermont-Ferrand—that the "gas chamber" had been especially useful in gassing Polish priests,[5] eventually the following official explanation came to pass:

> This gas chamber whose construction had been started in 1943, was still not completed in 1945 when the camp was liberated. No one could have been gassed in it.

The little room, which visitors are told is a "gas chamber," is in reality completely harmless and, while all sorts of construction plans are available for "Barrack X..." (the crematorium and vicinity), one cannot determine upon what basis or technical explanation one can claim that this structure is an "unfinished gas chamber."

Broszat

No official historical institute has done more than the Institut für Zeitgeschichte (Institute for Contemporary History) in Munich to make the myth of the "gas chambers" believable. Since 1972 its director has been Dr. Martin Broszat. As a member of this Institute since 1955, Dr. Broszat became famous as a result of his (partial!) publication in 1958 of the confessions that Rudolf Höss (former Commandant of Auschwitz) is supposed to have written in a communist

prison before he was hanged. However, on 19 August 1960, this historian had to tell his amazed countrymen that there had never been a "gas chamber" in the entire Old Reich (Germany's 1937 frontiers), but rather, only in a small number of selected places, especially in occupied Poland, including Auschwitz and Birkenau. This startling news was given in a simple letter to the editor which was published in the weekly magazine *Die Zeit* (19 August 1960, p16). The title was quite misleading and restrictive: "Keine Vergasung in Dachau" ("No Gassing at Dachau") instead of "Keine Vergasung im Altreich" ("No Gassing in the Old Reich"). In order to support this contention, Dr. Broszat provided not the slightest piece of evidence. Today, eighteen years after his letter, neither he nor any of his colleagues has provided the slightest explanation for this affirmation. It would be highly interesting to learn:

1. How does Dr. Broszat know that the "gas chambers" in the Old Reich were frauds?

2. How does he know that the "gas chambers" in Poland are genuine?

3. Why do the "proofs," the "certainties" and the "eyewitness accounts" concerning the concentration camps in the West suddenly have no value, while the "proofs," "certainties" and "eyewitness accounts" concerning the camps in Poland—Communist territory—still remain true?

As if by some tacit agreement, not a single recognized historian has raised these questions. How often in the "history of history" has one relied upon the claims of a single historian?

Polish Camps

Let us now examine the "gas chambers" in Poland.

For proof that the "gas chambers" in Belzec or Treblinka really existed, one is asked to rely essentially upon the

statement of Kurt Gerstein. This document from a member of the SS, who allegedly committed suicide in 1945 in the prison of Cherche-Midi in Paris, abounds with so many absurdities that in the eyes of historians it has for a long time already been thoroughly discredited.[6] Furthermore, this statement has never been made public, not even in the documents of the Nürnberg tribunal, except in an unusuable form (with truncations, falsifications, and rewritings...). The actual document has never been available with its absurd appendices (French "draft" or the "supplements" in German).

Regarding Maidanek, a visit to the actual site is absolutely necessary. It is even more convincing than a visit to Struthof-Natzweiler, if that is possible. Over this question I will publish additional information.

With regard to Auschwitz and Birkenau, one must rely essentially on the "Memoirs"[7] of Rudolf Höss, which were prepared under the supervision of his Polish captors. At the actual site, one can only find a "reconstructed" room (Auschwitz I) and ruins (Auschwitz II or Birkenau).

An execution with gas has nothing to do with a suicidal or accidental suffocation. In the case of an execution, the executioner and his team must not be exposed to the slightest danger. For their executions, the Americans employ hydrocyanic acid in a sophisticated way, and that only in a small, hermetically-sealed, chamber. Afterwards, the gas is exhausted from the chamber and neutralized.

For this reason, one must ask how, for example in the case of Auschwitz II or Birkenau, one could bring 2000 people into a room measuring 210 square meters in area, and then in this highly crowded situation throw in the very strong pesticide Zyklon B, and then **immediately** after the deaths of the victims let a work crew without any gasmasks enter the room in order to take out the bodies which had been thoroughly saturated with cyanide.

Two documents[8] from the German industrial archives which were registered by the Americans at Nürnberg tell us that the Zyklon B had a strong tendency to adhere to surfaces and could not be removed with a strong ventilator, but only

by natural aeration for almost 24 hours. Additional documents may be found only at the site in the Auschwitz Museum archives, which were never described elsewhere, but which show that this room of 210 square meters, which is today in a dilapidated condition, was only a very simple mortuary, which (in order to protect it against heat) had been located underground, and which was provided with only a single door which served as both an entrance and an exit.[9]

Concerning the crematoria of Auschwitz, there is—just as there is generally for the entire camp—an overabundance of documents and invoices down to the last penny. However, concerning the "gas chambers" there is nothing: no contract for construction, not even a study, nor an order for materials, nor a plan, nor an invoice, nor even a photograph. In a hundred war crimes trials, nothing of the sort was ever produced.

Christophersen

"I was in Auschwitz and I can assure you that there was no 'gas chamber' there." Only seldom does one hear defense witnesses with enough courage to pronounce this statement. They are persecuted in the courts.[10] Still today, everyone in Germany takes the risk that, if they give an eyewitness account in favor of Thies Christophersen (who wrote *The Auschwitz Lie*), they will be punished for "defaming the memory of the deceased."[11]

Immediately after the war, the Germans, the International Red Cross and the Vatican (which was otherwise so expert as to whatever happened in Poland), as well as many others, declared in an embarrassed tone: "The 'gas chambers' .... we knew nothing about them!" Yes but I would put the question this way: "Can one know about things which did not even happen?"

There was not a single "gas chamber" in even one of the German concentration camps; that is the truth. The nonexistence of "gas chambers" should be regarded as welcome news; to hide this news in the future would be an injustice. Just as there is no attack upon a religion if one portrays "Fatima" as a fraud, the announcement that the "gas cham-

bers" are an historical lie is no attack upon concentration camp survivors. One is merely doing one's duty being truthful.

FOOTNOTES

1. The expression is that of Olga Wormer-Migot, quoted from *Le Système Concentrationnaire Nazi (1933-1945) (The Nazi Concentration Camp System 1933-1945)*, Thesis, Paris, PUF, 1968, p541.

2. Associate Professor of the University of Lyon-2; speciality: Critic of Texts and Documents.

3. Regarding the great number of vicious and insulting articles, there is a study by Hermann Langbein which appeared in *Le Monde Juif (The Jewish World)*, April/June 1975. The title is "Coup d'oeil sur la littérature néo-nazie" ("A Glimpse at Neo-Nazi Literature"), pp8-20. Hermann Langbein was an inmate in Auschwitz. He testified at countless trials. He holds an important position in the circles of former concentration camp inmates. One of his most recent works is entitled: *Hommes et Femmes à Auschwitz (Men and Women of Auschwitz)*, Paris, Fayard, 1975, VIII-529p. (Translated from *Menschen in Auschwitz*, Vienna, 1974.) Not one of the 30 chapters, not one of the 268 sections of this book is devoted to "gas chambers"! Rather, one constantly sees expressions such as "selection for the gas chambers" etc. There is also a study by Georges Wellers which appeared in *Le Monde Juif (op. cit.)* April/June 1977. The title is "La 'Solution finale' de la question juive et la mythomanie néo-nazie" ("The 'Final Solution' and Neo-Nazi Mythomania"), pp41-84. There is also a study by Ino Arndt and Wolfgang Scheffler in *Viertelsjahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte (Quarterly Review for Contemporary History)*, which is a publication of the Institute for Contemporary History in Munich. The Institute's director is currently Dr. Martin Broszat. This study was published in the issue of April 1976. The title is: "Organisierter Massenmord an Juden in NS-Vernichtungslagern" ("Organized Mass-Murder in Nazi Extermination Camps"), pp105–135.

4. *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, Institute for Historical Review, 1979.

5. Prison et Deportation (Prison and Deportation), Paris, Spes, 1947, p77.

6. See the opinion expressed by the forensic pathologist as it is reported by the Exterminationist Pierre Joffroy in his book about Kurt Gerstein: *L'Espion de Dieu/La Passion de Kurt Gerstein (The Spy of God/The Passion of Kurt Gerstein)*, Paris, Grasset, 1969, p262.

7. *Kommandant in Auschwitz / Autobiographische Aufzeichnungen (Commandant of Auschwitz / Autobiographical Memoirs)* by Rudolf Höss, Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1958, 184p; introduction

and commentary by Dr. Martin Broszat. Concerning "gassing," see pages 126 and 166. The entry of the work crew into the "gas chamber" is supposed to happen "sofort" ("immediately") as it is written on page 166.

8. These two extensive documents which are of great importance were apparently not used at the trials of Gerhard Peters, former director of Degesch. They were registered as documents NI-9098 and NI-9912. They irrevocably reduce to nothing the "eyewitness testimony" of Höss regarding the "gas chambers."

9. Photographs Neg. 6228 and following.

10. Case of Wilhelm Stäglich, for example. See Stäglich in the *Index Nominum* of Butz's book (*op. cit.*).

11. *Die Auschwitz-Lüge (The Auschwitz Lie)*, #23 of *Kritik* (2341 Kälberhagen, Post Mohrkirch, West Germany), 1974. This booklet was followed by *Der Auschwitz-Betrug/Das Echo auf die Auschwitz-Lüge (The Auschwitz Fraud/The Echo of the Auschwitz Lie.)*.

SUPPLEMENT

A. Conclusion after 30 years of research by the Revisionist authors:

1. *The Hitler "gas chambers" never existed.*

2. *The "genocide" (or "attempted genocide") of the Jews never took place. In other words: Hitler never gave an order–nor permission–that anyone should be killed because of his race or religion.*

3. *The alleged "gas chambers" and the alleged "genocide" are one and the same lie.*

4. *This lie, which is largely of Zionist origin, has made an enormous political and financial fraud possible, whose principal beneficiary is the state of Israel.*

5. *The principal victims of this fraud are the German*

people (but not the German rulers) and the entire Palestinian people.

6. The enormous power of the official information services has, thus far, had the effect of ensuring the success of the lie and of censoring the freedom of expression of those who have denounced the lie.

7. The participants in this lie know that its days are numbered. They distort the purpose and nature of the Revisionist research. They label as "resurgence of Nazism" or as "falsification of history" what is only a thoughtful and justified concern for historical truth.

B. Two publications and an official intervention by R. Faurisson:

1. A letter to Historama, Paris, November 1975, p10, on the expression "N.N." These initials never meant: "Nacht und Nebel" ("Night and Fog") but "Nomen nescio" ("Anonymous"). In practice it meant that certain inmates would not be permitted to receive or send mail.

2. Segments of a letter to Historia, Paris, August 1977, p132: "The Imposture of Genocide."

3. On 29 January 1978 at the "Colloque National de Lyon sur Eglises et Chrétiens de France dans la Deuxième Guerre Mondiale" (National Convention in Lyon on Churches and Christians of France during the Second World War")—an intervention concerning the imposture of the "gas chambers" (see Rivarol, Paris, 16 February 1978, p5).

DECLARATION

I take no responsibility for the political views of others. On the contrary, I do take responsibility for the contents of the foregoing reviewed and corrected text which appeared in the magazine *Défense de l'Occident (Defense of the West)* in June 1978, pp32-40.

I take this responsibility in my name and as an Associate Professor of the University of Lyon-2.

I hereby contend that not a single "gas chamber" to kill human beings existed under the Hitler regime. This I firmly maintain and sign.

This article is the only English translation authorized by me.

Robert Faurisson

In the Matter of Robert Faurisson

JOHN BENNETT

Statement on oath by John Tuson Bennett of 122 Canning Street, Carlton Melbourne Australia, barrister and solicitor of the Supreme Court of Victoria.

I, John Tuson Bennett of 122 Canning Street Carlton Melbourne make oath and say as follows:

1. I am a barrister and solicitor of the Supreme Court of Victoria and have been employed by the Attorney General's Department of the Government of Australia since 1968, and am currently working in the legal aid section of that Department.

2. I graduated in law with honors from the University of Melbourne in 1958 and graduated in arts with honors from the same University in 1966. I am the author of various publications such as *Freedom of Expression in Australia*, *The Handbook of Citizens Rights, Police Powers and Citizens Rights* and *Your Rights. Your Rights* has sold over 120,000 copies in Australia and is the standard reference work on human rights in Australia.

3. I have been the Secretary of the Victorian Council for Civil Liberties since it was founded in 1966. The VCCL supports freedom of speech, freedom to conduct research, freedom to publish and freedom from arbitrary government actions; it investigates police misconduct, invasions of privacy and allegations of transgressions of citizens' rights, promotes law reform; and it takes steps to advise the public of their rights.

4. As a private citizen, I have exercised my own personal right to freedom of speech to conduct research and to publish my findings in various controversial areas of "history." In particular, I have conducted research into the treatment of Jews in Europe in WWII. I have come to the same conclusion as that reached by Professor A. Butz, Professor H. Barnes and Professor J. Martin in the United States of America, and by Associate Professor Robert Faurisson in France, that there was no plan in WWII to exterminate Jews and that there were no mass gassings. Professor Helmut Diwald has also raised serious questions about the Holocaust in his book *The History of the Germans*.

5. The question of the nature and extent of "The Holocaust" is freely debatable in the media in Australia, and it is not suggested that people such as myself are neo nazi or anti semitic, that we should be penalized in our jobs because of our views, or that we have committed "group libel." There is no law in Australia allowing people to sue for group libel, and I would regard any such law as a major threat to freedom of speech.

6. My findings challenging the nature of "The Holocaust" have been published in or referred to in the following parts of the Australian media.

A. In *The National Times* in an article dated 10 February 1979 and many subsequent letters. *The National Times* has a circulation of about 120,000 in Australia, which has a population of about 14 million. It is the major national weekly apart from *The Bulletin*.

B. In *The Age* in feature articles on 3 March 1979 and 28 March 1979, and in about 20 letters to the editor, *The Age* is Melbourne's major quality morning newspaper with a circulation of 200,000. A letter by me dated 15 March 1979 is attached.

C. In *Nation Review* a major left wing national weekly in many issues in 1979 including an article by me (dated 7 June 1979) which is attached.

D. In *The Bulletin* in a feature article dated 13 September 1979 and many subsequent letters some of which are attached. *The Bulletin* is a conservative weekly with a circulation of 90,000.

E. On the Australian Broadcasting Commission's TV program ABC2 *Nationwide* on 25 April 1979, on ABC radio *PM* on 29 October 1979 and on the Australia wide *Willesee* TV show on 9 November 1979.

A cassette tape of my comments on these shows is attached. The ABC is the Australian equivalent of the British Broadcasting Commission (the BBC).

F. In *The Melbourne Herald* in a letter dated the 25 October 1979 a copy of which is attached. *The Herald* is Melbourne's only afternoon daily and has a circulation of 460,000.

The above news items indicate that the "Holocaust" is a legitimate matter for debate in a society such as Australia which values its freedom of speech. Any attempts to suppress freedom of speech could lead to suppression of the truth.

Also in Australia, if there was any suggestion that a judicial officer was biased or had preconceptions in relation to the issues in any court case he would disqualify himself, on the basis that "justice must not only be done but must be seen to be done," which is a maxim of our legal system.

7. The above news items numbered A, B, C, D, E and F are attached hereto and marked with the letters "A" "B" "C" "D" "E" and "F."

8. The publication *Your Rights* referred to in paragraph 2 above is attached hereto and marked with the letter "G."

9. The Victorian Council for Civil Liberties of which I am secretary has endorsed my right as a private citizen to con-

duct personal research and publish my findings and has issued the following statement in support of Robert Faurisson's right to do likewise:—

"TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

The Victorian Council for Civil Liberties believes that the treatment of Professor Robert Faurisson by the University of Lyon, by sections of the French media, and by some decisions of French courts is scandalous, and can be compared in some respects with the Dreyfus case in France.

The VCCL believes that the Civil Rights of Professor Faurisson have been infringed and in particular that his civil rights to conduct research, to have freedom of speech, and to have academic freedom have been infringed.

It is the right to anyone to conduct research and publish his findings on any subject including controversial areas of History such as the Holocaust, and attempts to harass, victimize and silence anyone conducting such research are incompatible with the principles of a free society.

The VCCL which was established in 1966 covers the second largest state or province in Australia, and has consistently been opposed to book censorship, censorship of ideas and suppression of information by the media, and has consistently supported the civil rights of individuals in relation to the State and other organizations such as the media and universities. John Bennett Secretary Victorian Council for Civil Liberties."

10. I am prepared to attend court proceedings in France to give evidence on behalf of Robert Faurisson and to be cross examined on this, my affidavit. I believe that attempts to silence, victimize and harass Robert Faurisson are designed to prevent free debate on an important historical issue, and that the attempts are incompatible with the principles of a free society.

Sworn at Melbourne in the State of Victoria.

Before me A Commissioner of the Supreme Court
in the State of Victoria for taking affidavits.

Now that you have read Lilienthal's *Zionist Connection*, read the rest of the story in

AMERICAN MANIFEST DESTINY

and the

HOLOCAUSTS

Millions of People Exterminated

Where It Happened
When It Happened
How It Happened
Who Made It Happen

An Historical and Sociological History of Domestic and Foreign Affairs

380 pages, card cover $8.00
Add 80 c postage
NYC orders add 8%
NY State 6% Sales Tax.

Examiner Books, P.O. Box 783, NYC 10022

The Corpse Factory

ARTHUR PONSONBY

A series of extracts will give the record of one of the most revolting lies invented during the First World War, the dissemination of which throughout not only Britain but the world was encouraged and connived at by both the Government and the press. It started in 1917, and was not finally disposed of till 1925.

(Most of the quotations given are from *The Times*. The references in the lower strata of the press, it will be remembered, were far more lurid.)

> One of the United States consuls, on leaving Germany in February 1917, stated in Switzerland that the Germans were distilling glycerine from the bodies of their dead.
>
> *The Times* 16 April 1917

> Herr Karl Rosner, the Correspondent of the Berlin *Lokalanzeiger*, on the Western front . . . published last Tuesday the first definite German admission concerning the way in which the Germans use dead bodies.
>
> We pass through Everingcourt. There is a dull smell in the air as if lime were being burnt. We are passing the great Corpse Exploitation Establishment (*Kadaververwertungsanstalt*) of this Army Group. The fat that is won here is turned into lubricating oils, and everything else is ground down in the bone mill into a powder which is used for mixing with pig's food and as manure—nothing can be permitted to go to waste.
>
> *The Times* 16 April 1917

There was a report in *The Times* of 17 April 1917 from *La Belgique* (Leyden), via *l'Indépendance Belge*, 10 April, giving a very long and detailed account of a Deutsche Abfallverwertungs-gesellschaft factory near Coblenz, where train-loads of the stripped bodies of German soldiers, wired into bundles, arrive and are simmered down in cauldrons,

the products being stearine and refined oil.

In *The Times* of 18 April 1917, there was a letter from C.E. Bunbury commenting and suggesting the use of the story for propaganda purposes, in neutral countries and the East, where it would be especially calculated to horrify Buddhists, Hindus, and Mohammedans. He suggested broadcasting by the Foreign Office, India Office, and Colonial Office; there were other letters to the same effect on 19 April.

In *The Times* of 20 April 1917, there was a story told by Sergeant B____, of the Kents, that a prisoner had told him that the Germans boil down their dead for munitions and pig and poultry food. "This fellow told me that Fritz calls his margarine 'corpse fat' because they suspect that's what it comes from."

The Times stated that it had received a number of letters "questioning the translation of the German word *Kadaver*, and suggesting that it is not used of human bodies. As to this, the best authorities are agreed that it is also used of the bodies of animals." Other letters were received confirming the story from Belgian and Dutch sources (later from Roumania).

There was an article in the *Lancet* discussing the "business aspect" (or rather the technical one) of the industry. An expression of horror appeared from the Chinese Minister in London, and also from the Maharajah of Bikanir, in *The Times* of 21 April 1917.

The Times of 23 April 1917, quotes a German statement that the report is "loathsome and ridiculous," and that *Kadaver* is never used of a human body. *The Times* produces dictionary quotations to show that it is. Also that both *Tierkorpermehl* and *Kadavermehl* appear in German official catalogs, the implication being that they must be something different.

In *The Times* of 24 April 1917, there was a letter, signed E.H. Parker, enclosing copy of the *North China Herald*, 3 March 1917, recounting an interview between the German Minister and the Chinese Premier in Pekin:

> But the matter was clinched when Admiral von Hinke was dilating upon the ingenious methods by which German scientists were obtaining chemicals necessary for the manufacture of munitions. The admiral triumphantly stated that they

were extracting glycerine out of their dead soldiers! From that moment onward the horrified Premier had no more use for Germany, and the business of persuading him to turn against her became comparatively easy.

The following questions in Parliament show the Government evading the issue, although they knew there was not a particle of authentic evidence for the report—a good instance of the official method of spreading falsehood.

Mr. Ronald McNeill asked the Prime Minister if he will take steps to make it known as widely as possible in Egypt, India, and the East generally, that the Germans use the dead bodies of their own soldiers and of their enemies when they obtain possession of them, as food for swine.

Mr. Dillon asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether his attention has been called to the reports widely circulated in this country that the German Government have set up factories for extracting fat from the bodies of soldiers killed in battle; whether these reports have been endorsed by many prominent men in this country, including Lord Curzon of Kedleston; whether the Government have any solid grounds for believing that these statements are well-founded; and if so, whether he will communicate the information at the disposal of the Government to the House.

Lord R. Cecil: With respect to this question and that standing in the name of the Hon. Member for East Mayo, the Government have no information at present beyond that contained in extracts from the German Press which have been published in the Press here. In view of other actions by German military authorities, there is nothing incredible in the present charge against them. His Majesty's Government have allowed the circulation of facts as they have appeared through the usual channels.

Mr. McNeill: Can the Right Hon. Gentleman answer whether the Government will take any steps to give wide publicity in the East to this story emanating from German sources?

Lord R. Cecil: I think at present it is not desirable to take any other steps than those that have been taken.

Mr. Dillon: May I ask whether we are to conclude from that answer that the Government have no solid evidence whatever in proof of the truth of this charge, and they have taken no steps to investigate it; and has their attention been turned to

the fact that it is not only a gross scandal, but a very great evil to this country to allow the circulation of such statements, authorized by Ministers of the Crown, if they are, as I believe them to be, absolutely false?

Lord R. Cecil: The Hon. Member has, perhaps, information that we have not. I can only speak from statements that have been published in the Press. I have already told the House that we have no other information whatever. The information is the statement that has been published and that I have before me (quoting *Times* quotation from *Lokalanzeiger*). This statement has been published in the Press, and that is the whole of the information that I have.

Mr. Dillon: Has the Noble Lord's attention been drawn to the fact that there have been published in the *Frankfurter Zeitung* and other leading German newspapers descriptions of this whole process, in which the word *Kadaver* is used, and from which it is perfectly manifest that these factories are for the purpose of boiling down the dead bodies of horses and other animals which are lying on the battlefield—(an Hon. Member: "Human animals!")—and I ask the Right Hon. Gentleman whether the Government propose to take any steps to obtain authentic information whether this story that has been circulated is true or absolutely false. For the credit of human nature, he ought to.

Lord R. Cecil: It is not any part of the duties of the Government, nor is it possible for the Government, to institute inquiries as to what goes on in Germany. The Hon. Member is surely very unreasonable in making the suggestion, and as for his quotations from the *Frankfurter Zeitung*, I have not seen them, but I have seen statements made by the German Government after the publication of this, and I confess that I am not able to attach very great importance to any statements made by the German Government.

Mr. Dillon: I beg to ask the Right Hon. Gentleman whether, before a Minister of the Crown, a member of the War Cabinet, gives authorization to these rumors, he ought not to have obtained accurate information as to whether they are true or not.

Lord R. Cecil: I think any Minister of the Crown is entitled to comment on and refer to something which has been published in one of the leading papers of the country. He only purported to do that, and did not make himself responsible for the statement (an Hon. Member: "He did!"). I am informed that he did not. He said: "As has been stated in the papers."

> Mr. Outhwaite: May I ask if the Noble Lord is aware that the circulation of these reports (interruption) has caused anxiety and misery to British people who have lost their sons on the battlefield, and who think that their bodies may be put to this purpose, and does not that give a reason why he should try to find out the truth of what is happening in Germany?
>
> *House of Commons*, 30 April 1917

In *The Times* of 3 May 1917, there were quotations from the *Frankfurter Zeitung* stating that the French Press is now treating the *Kadaver* story as a "misunderstanding."

The Times of 17 May 1917 reported that Herr Zimmermann denied in the Reichstag that human bodies were used; and stated that the story appeared first in the French Press.

In reply to a question in the House of Commons on 23 May, Mr. A. Chamberlain stated that the report would be "available to the public in India through the usual channels."

A corpse factory cartoon appeared in *Punch*.

> Kaiser (to 1917 recruit): And don't forget that your Kaiser will find a use for you alive or dead. (At the enemy's establishment for the utilization of corpses the dead bodies of German soldiers are treated chemically, the chief commercial products being lubricant oils and pig food.)
>
> View of the corpse factory out of the window.

The story had a world-wide circulation and had considerable propaganda value in the East. Not till 1925 did the truth emerge.

> A painful impression has been produced here by an unfortunate speech of Brigadier-General Charteris at the dinner of the National Arts Club, in which he professed to tell the true story of the war-time report that Germany was boiling down the bodies of her dead soldiers in order to get fats for munitions and fertilizers.
>
> According to General Charteris, the story began as propaganda for China. By transposing the caption from one of two photographs found on German prisoners to the other he gave the impression that the Germans were making a dreadful use of their own dead soldiers. This photograph he sent to a Chinese newspaper in Shanghai. He told the familiar story of

its later republication in England and of the discussion it created there. He told, too, how, when a question put in the House was referred to him, he answered it by saying that from what he knew of German mentality, he was prepared for anything.

Later, said General Charteris, in order to support the story, what purported to be the diary of a German soldier was forged in his office. It was planned to have this discovered on a dead German by a war correspondent with a passion for German diaries, but the plan was never carried out. The diary was now in the war museum in London.

The Times 22 October 1925. From *New York Correspondent.*

Some opinions of politicians may be given.

Lloyd George: The story came under my notice in various ways at the time. I did not believe it then; I do not believe it now. It was never adopted as part of the armory of the British Propaganda Department. It was, in fact, "turned down" by that department.

Mr. Masterman: We certainly did not accept the story as true, and I know nobody in official positions at the time who credited it. Nothing as suspect as this was made use of in our propaganda. Only such information as had been properly verified was circulated.

Mr. I. Macpherson: I was at the War Office at the time. We had no reason to doubt the authenticity of the story when it came through. It was supported by the captured divisional orders of the German Army in France, and I have an impression it was also backed up by the Foreign Office on the strength of extracts from the German Press. We did not know that it had been invented by anybody, and had we known there was the slightest doubt about the truth of the story, it would not have been used in any way by us.

A New York correspondent describes how he rang General Charteris up, and inquired the truth of the report and suggested that, if untrue, he should take it up with the *New York Times.*

On this he protested vigorously that he could not think of challenging the report, as the mistakes were only of minor importance.

Daily News 5 November 1925

There was a *Times* article on the same subject quoting the *New York Times'* assertion of the truth of their version of the speech.

This paper makes the significant observation that in the course of his denial he offered no comment on his reported admission that he avoided telling the truth when questioned about the matter in the House of Commons, or on his own description of a scheme to support the Corpse Factory story by "planting" a forged diary in the clothing of a dead German prisoner—a proposal which he only abandoned lest the deception might be discovered.

Brigadier-General Charteris, who returned from America at the week-end, visited the War Office yesterday and had an interview with the Secretary of State for War (Sir Laming Worthington-Evans) concerning the reports of his speech on war propaganda in New York. It is understood that the War Office now regard the incident as closed and that no further inquiry is likely to be held.

General Charteris left for Scotland later in the day, and on arrival in Glasgow issued the following statement:

"On arrival in Scotland I was surprised to find that, in spite of the repudiation issued by me at New York through Reuter's agency, some public interest was still excited in the entirely incorrect report of my remarks at a private dinner in New York. I feel it necessary therefore to give again a categorical denial to the statement attributed to me. Certain suggestions and speculations as regards the origins of the *Kadaver* story, which have already been published in *These Eventful Years* (British Encyclopedia Press) and elsewhere, which I repeated, are, doubtless unintentionally, but nevertheless unfortunately, turned into definite statements of fact and attributed to me.

"Lest there should still be any doubt, let me say that I neither invented the *Kadaver* story nor did I alter the captions in any photographs, nor did I use faked material for propaganda purposes. The allegations that I did so are not only incorrect but absurd, as propaganda was in no way under

G.H.Q. France, where I had charge of the Intelligence Services. I should be as interested as the general public to know what was the true origin of the *Kadaver* story. G.H.Q. France only came in when a fictitious diary supporting the *Kadaver* story was submitted. When this diary was discovered to be fictitious, it was at once rejected.

"I have seen the Secretary of State this morning and have explained the whole circumstances to him, and have his authority to say that he is perfectly satisfied."

The Times 4 November 1925

Lieut.-Commander Kenworthy asked the Secretary of State for War if, in view of the feeling aroused in Germany by the recrudescence of the rumours of the so-called corpse conversion factory behind the German lines in the late war, he can give any information as to the source of the original rumour and the extent to which it was accepted by the War Office at the time.

Sir L. Worthington-Evans: At this distance of time I do not think that the source of the rumour can be traced with any certainty. The statement that the Germans had set up a factory for the conversion of dead bodies first appeared on 10 April 1917, in the *Lokalanzeiger*, published in Berlin, and in *l'Independance Belge* and *La Belgique*, two Belgian newspapers published in France and Holland. The statements were reproduced in the Press here, with the comment that it was the first German admission concerning the way in which the Germans used their dead bodies.

Questions were asked in the House of Commons on 30 April 1917, and the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs replied on behalf of the Government that he had then no information beyond that contained in the extract from the German Press. But shortly afterwards a German Army Order containing instructions for the delivery of dead bodies to the establishments described in the *Lokalznzeiger* was captured in France and forwarded to the War Office, who, after careful consideration, permitted it to be published.

The terms of this order were such that, taken in conjunction with the articles in the *Likalanzeiger* and in the two Belgian papers and the previously existing rumours, it appeared to the War Office to afford corroborative evidence of the story. Evidence that the word *Kadaver* was used to mean human bodies, and not only carcasses of animals, was found in German dictionaries and anatomical and other works, and the

German assertion that the story was disposed of by reference to the meaning of the word *Kadaver* was not accepted. On the information before them at the time, the War Office appear to have seen no reason to disbelieve the truth of the story.

Lieut.-Commander Kenworthy: I am much obliged to the Right Hon. Gentleman for his very full answer. Does he not think it desirable now that the War Office should finally disavow the story and their present belief in it?

Sir L. Worthington-Evans: I cannot believe any public interest is served by further questions on this story. I have given the House the fullest information in my possession in the hope that the Hon. Members will be satisfied with what I have said. (Hon. Members: Hear, hear.)

Lieut.-Commander Kenworthy: Does not the Right Hon. Gentleman think it desirable, even now, to finally admit the inaccuracy of the original story, in view of Locarno and other things?

Sir L. Worthington-Evans: It is not a question of whether it was accurate or inaccurate. What I was concerned with was the information upon which the War Office acted at the time. Of course, the fact that there has been no corroboration since necessarily alters the complexion of the case, but I was dealing with the information in the possession of the authorities at the time.

House of Commons, 24 November 1925

This was a continued attempt to avoid making a complete denial, and it was left to Sir Austen Chamberlain to nail the lie finally to the counter. In reply to Mr. Arthur Henderson on 2 December 1925, asking if he had any statement to make as to the *Kadaver* story, he said:

Yes, sir; my Right Hon. Friend the Secretary of State for War told the House last week how the story reached His Majesty's Government in 1917. The Chancellor of the German Reich has authorized me to say, on the authority of the German Government, that there was never any foundation for it. I need scarcely add that on behalf of His Majesty's Government I accept this denial, and I trust that this false report will not again be revived.

The painful impression made by this episode and similar propaganda efforts in America is well illustrated by an edito-

rial in *Times-Dispatch*, of Richmond, U.S.A., on 6 December 1925.

> Not the least of the horrors of modern warfare is the propaganda bureau, which is an important item in the military establishment of every nation. Neither is it the least of the many encouraging signs which each year add to the probability of eventual peace on earth. The famous *Kadaver* story, which aroused hatred against the German to the boiling-point in this and other Allied nations during the war, has been denounced as a lie in the British House of Commons. Months ago the world learned the details of how this lie was planned and broadcasted by the efficient officer in the British Intelligence Service. Now we are told that, imbued with the spirit of the Locarno pact, Sir Austen Chamberlain rose in the House, said that the German Chancellor had denied the truth of the story, and that the denial had been accepted by the British Government.
>
> A few years ago the story of how the Kaiser was reducing human corpses to fat aroused the citizens of this and other enlightened nations to a fury of hatred. Normally sane men doubled their fists and rushed off to the nearest recruiting sergeant. Now they are being told, in effect, that they were dupes and fools; that their own officers deliberately goaded them to the desired boiling-point, using an infamous lie to arouse them, just as a grown bully whispers to one little boy that another little boy said he could lick him.
>
> The encouraging sign found in this revolting admission of how modern war is waged is the natural inference that the modern man is not over-eager to throw himself at his brother's throat at the simple word of command. His passions must be played upon, so the propaganda bureau has taken its place as one of the chief weapons.
>
> In the next war, the propaganda must be more subtle and clever than the best the World War produced. These frank admissions of wholesale lying on the part of trusted Governments in the last war will not soon be forgotten.

Human Soap

RICHARD HARWOOD & DITLIEB FELDERER

It is variously claimed by the Exterminationists that human corpses underwent melting by some rendering process whereby raw material for soap was made. The process, means, and distribution system, are all totally unknown.

Immediately after liberation, in Politiceni in Romania, the district rabbi ordered the collection of all bars of soap bearing the letters "RIF". After the recitation of the Kaddisch (the Jewish prayer for the dead) the bars of soap were then buried in the Jewish cemetery. News reports about the incident appeared in the local Polish press, which were later picked up in such "Holocaust" books as F.C. Weiskopf's *Elend und Grösse unserer Tage* (*The Misery & Greatness of Our Days*), 1950.

Also, an article in the *Paris Match* about Anne Frank, written by Pierre Joffroy, reports that

> four bars of "Jewish soap" manufactured from corpses in the extermination camps and which, discovered in Germany, were wrapped in a shroud, in 1948, and piously buried according to the rites in a corner of Haifa cemetery in Israel.
>
> *Paris Match*, No. 395, 3 November 1956, p93

The letters "RIF" actually stand for Reichsstelle für Industrielle Fettversorgung: the German government outlet which oversaw the production and distribution of soap and detergent products. These letters were twisted by the Exterminationists to mean "Rein Jüdisches Fett" ("Pure Jewish Fat").

The Exterminationist Nachum Blumental from Tel Aviv writes that this soap was one of the most important display objects in Holocaust museums around the world. He reports

that bars of such soap are exhibited at the Historical Institute of Warsaw, at the Kaznelson House of the Ghettofighters' Kibbutz in Israel, and at the YIVO Institute for Jewish Research in New York. He also writes that bits of "RIF" soap are to be found in the Keller des Grauens on Mount Zion in Jerusalem. (See *Übersetzung Aus dem Hebräischen Deckblatt; Jiddische Kultur Monatsschrift des Jiddischen Kulturverbandes*, #21, June-July 1959, p1.)

A Mr. Yaakov Riz of 1453 Levick Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, operates his own "Holocaust" Museum out of his basement, under the auspices of what he calls the "Brotherhood to Prevent Genocide." He displays a jeweled soap dish inscribed "Soap Made of Jewish Bodies" complete with a fragment of soap which is claimed to be made of human fat. However, no forensic analysis has ever been made of the soap. Riz, who claims to have lost 83 of his relatives at Auschwitz, was captured by the Red Army in which he promptly enlisted. He was later court-martialed (offense unknown), but after serving time in a Gulag, was repatriated to Poland from whence he emigrated to Israel to join the Zionist fight to take Palestine away from its inhabitants. He came to the United States in 1952 (*Philadelphia Inquirer*, 21 April 1979).

Among the best known Exterminationist authors, Reitlinger omits any mention of human soap, while Hilberg (*31*: p624) doubts the authenticity of the claim. But he says that the effectiveness of the human soap "rumor" lay not in its truthfulness; for it was "probably not" true; but in its efficiency in transmitting to the world the brutality of the Nazis.

"Evidence" for the human soap claim was submitted at the IMT Nürnberg Trials by the Soviets. Butz reproduces a photograph of the Soviet cakes in his book (*109*: p201), which is in fact Nürnberg documentary exhibit number PS 3421-2, now lodged at the U.S. National Archives in Washington. Pellessier provides a picture of human soap along with some other specimens from a "macabre collection" at Buchenwald in his book (*19*: p64). The *Encyclopedia Judaica* has two photographs; one showing a room of the purported "soap factory"; the other one showing human bodies in a box (1, *Vol.13*: pp761-2 "Poland"). The caption states: "A German soap factory near Danzig."

The history of the allegation can be traced back to September 1942, when Rabbi Stephen Wise (1874-1949) announced that he had received a message from an official of the World Jewish Congress in Europe reporting on the manufacture of soap and artificial fertilizer from Jewish bodies. Naturally, the report was greeted at the time with a certain amount of skepticism, since the Americans and British had already encountered such an allegation during the First World War: an allegation which had turned out to be Allied propaganda. (See Arthur Ponsonby, *Falsehood in Wartime*, IHR, 1980.)

So, later in the same month, Gerhart Riegner, a World Jewish Congress representative in Switzerland, came forward with new documents to "prove" the allegation. The documents, Riegner said, had been prepared by an officer (anonymous) connected to the German High Command and had reached him through intermediaries. This anonymous officer claimed that there were at least two factories in existence manufacturing soap, glue, and lubricants from Jewish corpses, and that it had been determined that each Jewish corpse was worth 50 Reichsmarks. I have yet to uncover any invoices or bookkeeping entries among the mountains of German documents to support this valuation.

One source alleges that Rabbi Stephen Wise "knew" about the "human soap" manufacture earlier than September 1942, but didn't believe it, or didn't want to believe it. The allegation had been made by an escapee from Belzitz(?) camp who reported it to Rabbi Michael Weissmandel, an ultra-Orthodox Jewish leader in Slovakia. Weissmandel communicated the report—which also included the first allegations of gassings—to representatives of the World Jewish Congress in Budapest, and in Switzerland. When the report was translated into English in New York, the part about "human soap" was omitted by Tartakover, the executive director.

Rabbi Weissmandel later emigrated to the United States, and set up an ultra-Orthodox seminary in New York State. He died in November 1957, but in 1960 his war memoirs were published posthumously in Hebrew as *Min Hamaitzar* (*From the Depths*) available for $6.50 from Beis Hasefer Book Store, 169a Ross Street, Brooklyn, NY 11211.

An ardent follower of Weissmandel, Rabbi Moshe Shonfeld, uses many excerpts from the memoirs in his indictment of Zionism—which the Jewish zealots regard as blasphemy—entitled *The Holocaust Victims Accuse (qv)*. Shonfeld reports that Weissmandel's message to the American Jews was deliberately suppressed because, being Zionists, they were agreeable to having some aged and useless Jews martyred by the Nazis so that the young Jews could gain passage to Palestine. He says that it was only when Rabbi Wise was actually presented with a bar of Jewish soap that he had to organize some kind of protest (Shonfeld, pp40-41).

This allegation is somewhat ironic, for Dr. Butz indicates in his book (*109*: p247) that Weissmandel was the likely initial source of the *entire* Holocaust myth, and that his training in Talmudic lore enabled him to draw on a rich and bizarre well of imagery. Butz cites Talmudic passages which describe how 4 billion (or in other sources, 40 million) Jews were slain by the Romans; how the tidal wave of Jewish blood carried boulders into the sea and stained the water for four miles out; how Jewish bodies were used as fence posts; how Jewish blood was used as fertilizer on Roman vineyards; and how Jewish children were rolled up in their Torah scroll and burned alive. In his book *The Six Million Reconsidered* (Noontide, 1979), William Grimstad deals even more effectively with the uncanny resemblance of modern-day "Holocaust" allegations with ancient Talmudic and Biblical anecdotes. On page 42, he shows a Talmudic illustration of the Fiery Statue of Molech, which he points out, bears a curious similarity to Auschwitzian "gas-ovens."

But there is in the U.S. National Archives a document number 740.00116 EW/726, which appears to be "information" received in November 1942 from an anonymous Vatican source called "Mr. F." It consists of a three-page description in French of events which were allegedly transpiring in Poland. *Inter alia*, the document reports:

> Farms for the breeding of human beings are being organized to which women and girls are brought for the purpose of being made mothers of children who are then taken from them to be raised in Nazi establishments ... Mass execution of

> Jews continues ... They are killed by poison gas in chambers especially prepared for that purpose (often in railway cars) and by machine-gun fire, following which the dead and the dying are covered with earth ... Reports are being circulated to the effect that the Germans are making use of their corpses in plants manufacturing chemical products (soap making factories).

It would thus appear that the entire allegation is founded on anonymous reports and speculative hearsay. No one can come up with any locations, dates, or names. Of course, this has not prevented popular "historians" such as William L. Shirer from perpetuating the myth:

> There was testimony at the Nuremberg Trials that the ashes were sometimes sold as fertilizer. One Danzig firm, according to a document offered by the Russian prosecution, constructed an electrically-heated tank for making soap out of human fat. Its "recipe" called for "12 pounds of human fat, 10 quarts of water, and 8 ounces to a pound of caustic soda ... all boiled for two or three days and then cooled. (4: p1264)

As "authority" Shirer states in his footnote 59: Nürnberg document "ND USSR-8, p197. Transcript" (4: p1518). I suppose he must mean the same "electrically-heated tank" which appears in the *Encyclopedia Judaica* described above. Unfortunately, the encyclopedia does not give a source for this illustration.

Let us pause for a moment and examine this Soviet soap recipe. We must assume, first of all, that quite a few corpses will be needed to obtain 12 pounds of fat, since we are told the Jews were just skin and bone anyway. But the Soviet idea of boiling "all" the ingredients together just does not coincide with established soap formulas. Norman Stark's *Formula Book* calls for "a lot of rendered animal fat" and states that the water and caustic soda should be mixed with **cold** water (*20*: p63). Our Soviet "experts" must have missed some basics on soap-making, for Stark tells us that the caustic soda should **not** be boiled with the water as the mixture will heat up anyway by the chemical action of the lye. The tallow is then melted, and after proper adjustment of the temperature, the lye solution is poured into the tallow and

then stirred. This process would seem to make redundant the "electrically heated tank" shown in the encyclopedia. One also wonders about capacity.

Eight ounces of caustic soda for each pound of human fat must mean 96 ounces for this recipe. Most of the water, 10 quarts of it, would mix with the lye. I simply cannot understand how the ultra-efficient Germans, working with the mass extermination of millions of people (as they were supposed to), would have bothered with such a small "factory," fussing around with eight ounces of this and ten quarts of that. Surely the "mills of death" could do better than this?

In the process of tracking down mentions of "human soap" I came across a modern Polish tract by Dr. Adolf Gawalewicz which stated that "soup was prepared from human flesh" (3: insert p7). Knowing how badly Polish translations are often made, I thought that the author perhaps meant "soap," but a cross-reference to the French and German translations again shows "soup." This would appear to be one of the even rarer allegations that the Germans encouraged cannibalism!

Many Exterminationist books make no mention at all of the "soap" story; even outlandish books such as *We Have Not Forgotten* (2 & 6) which covers every other conceivable German atrocity. The same is true of the numerous other "Holocaustiana" books which I have plowed through. Surely if there were such factories there would be ample evidence to write book after book, article after article, on this one subject.

Even the "authoritative" 7 volume report of the International Auschwitz Committee, written by the same Dr. Gawalewicz who wrote the Auschwitz guide-book (3) referred to above, makes only passing reference to "human soap." The English edition of the work states:

> Is that not some sort of exaggeration, some unintended injustice, in regard to those hundreds of thousands whose ashes were scattered by the wind—nobody knows where—whose bodies were dissolved to use the fat for soap; whose hair was used to make mattrasses?
>
> (*Vol.* 3, Part 1: p36)

(I suppose the translators have come adrift here again, for a

"mattrass" is a slender glass tube used in a laboratory. They probably mean "mattress"). This is the only mention of "soap" throughout this massive work, in spite of all those "hundreds of thousands." Evidently something must be wrong.

Determined to get to the bottom of the "human soap" problem, I paid a visit to Danzig, and unsuccessfully tried to locate the site of the "human soap factory." At the nearby Stutthof "extermination camp" I again sought evidence, but not one of the officials or guides there could help. Nor was there any evidence on display in among the numerous other examples of German "atrocities."

I journeyed deeper into Poland to the museum of Auschwitz-Birkenau, and when I again found no evidence of "human soap" on display, I inquired of the officials if they might have a sample in their archives. I spoke with Mrs. Irena Stafanska, curator of the archives, and Mr. Franciszek Piper, one of the museum guides. Finally, Piper shook his shoulders, gave me a pleasant smile, and informed me embarrassingly that their own forensic examination of their "human soap" samples had proved it to be just ordinary soap. But what about the specimens of "human soap" which had been exhibited at Nürnberg? Where were they? Were they not at Auschwitz?

I was unable to penetrate the subject any further, as no one was enthusiastic about hearing any more about it. I continued my search through the exhibits, but still was unable to find any trace.

Undoubtedly the "human soap" World War Two version is just about as real as the World War One yarn about the wicked Huns turning the bodies of their dead soldiers into soap. At the end of WWI, a certain Virginia newspaper editorialized that in future wars "propaganda must be more subtle and clever." (Ponsonby, pp102-113). But obviously the paper did not have a high circulation in Russia, for the Soviets did not heed their advice in the later conflagration.

It is certain that if the western public realized that almost all of these atrocity allegations emanated from the communist bloc, then they would receive about as much credence as contemporary communist propaganda about inter-

vening in Hungary, Czechoslovakia and now Afghanistan to "rescue the inhabitants from foreign interference." Americans especially know how communist interrogators can force bogus confessions out of prisoners through torture techniques. We have many examples from Korea and Viet-Nam. But the sorry fact is that these communist WWII allegations are underscored and recycled throughout the western media by ardent Zionists. It would seem that Zionists have such influence within the media that they can promote these communist lies almost without restriction. The only limit seems to be how gullible the general public really is.

After the showing of the "soap"-opera *Holocaust* on television, many Zionist leaders expressed worries that perhaps this might be going too far. The Chief Rabbi in London warned against "sanctifying the Holocaust" in the *Jewish Chronicle* (6 July 1979). Gitta Sereny writing in the *New Statesman* (2 November 1979) admitted that many "Holocaust survivor testimonies" are "partial or complete fakes" and that "Auschwitz, despite its emblematic name, was **not** primarily an extermination camp."

With such admissions as these, one wonders how long it will be before the Exterminationists realize that they have overdone it a little bit, and begin to switch horses. I firmly predict that before very long the Exterminationists will announce that the "gas chambers" were all communist propaganda, and that the Six Million were in fact worked to death, not gassed to death. The paucity of evidence for the "gas chambers," "human soap," "lampshades," *et al.* will necessitate that.

References

The numbers used refer to the Ditlieb Felderer's Revisionist Bibliography of almost 200 Revisionist and Exterminationist titles, which is available direct from the author. Those titles mentioned in this text are as follows:

1. *Eycyclopedia Judaica*, Jerusalem, 16 volumes, 1971/2.
2. Mazur, Tomaszewski & Wrzos-Glinka, editors, 1939-1945 *We Have Not Forgotten*, Warsaw, 1960, 267pp.

3. Marcinek (editor), Bujak & Gawalewicz, *Auschwitz-Birkenau*, Warsaw, no date, 128pp.

4. William L. Shirer, *The Rise & Fall of the Third Reich*, Fawcett, 1968, 1599pp.

6. Mazur & Tomaszewski, *1938-1945 We Have Not Forgotten*, Warsaw, 1961, (abridged from No. 2), 160pp.

19. Jean Pelissier, *Camps de Mort (Camps of Death)*, Paris, 1946.

20. Norman Stark, *The Formula Book*, Sheed & Ward, Kansas, 1976.

31. Raul Hilberg, *Destruction of the European Jews*, Quadrangle, 1967.

109. Arthur R. Butz, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, IHR, 1979.

Letter From Berlin

OTTO KANOLD WITH MARK WEBER

I first heard about your Revisionist Conference in a rather short, two page report in issue 3/79 of *Bauernschaft* (October 1979), published by my friend Thies Christophersen (D 2341 Mohrkirch). I saw a more complete report in the *South African Observer* (P.O. Box 2401, Pretoria, South Africa, November 1979, pp11-15) which I receive by airmail.

I have known several of the participants attending your meeting for some years now—some of them personally. Above all, I exchanged correspondence in the 1950s and beginning of the 1960s with the honorable Harry Elmer Barnes. He encouraged David L. Hoggan, the author of *Der Erzwungene Krieg*, a book which was immediately damned in Germany. Barnes also arranged for the translation of the work into German. We Germans above all owe thanks and respect to Prof. Barnes because over 50 years ago he made a very important contribution to subduing the **first war guilt lie** against the German Reich and people.

I own a German translation of his work, *Die Entstehung des Weltkrieges (The Origin of the World War)*, published in 1928 by the Deutsche Verlagsanstalt (Stuttgart, Berlin and Leipzig). I was a school pupil when the victorious powers forced a signature to the dictated peace of Versailles by continuing the hunger blockade against Germany which claimed 100,000 German children as victims even **after** the armistice of 11 November 1918 and which extorted the German acknowledgement of guilt (Article 231) for the (first) world war. Of course, the Reich government and the entire German public had already undertaken a worldwide moral campaign against this war guilt lie.

Back then, all factions of our people were united in the

urgent necessity of resisting or refuting the war guilt lie contained in Article 231 of the Versailles "treaty." With the active leadership of the Reich governments, regardless of political party, this resistance was conducted on a foundation of historical science. German and foreign historians worked together, and among the latter, Harry Elmer Barnes was the greatest and most important. The Reich government, back then, showed great honor to him, and, significantly, Kaiser Wilhelm II was proven innocent of the war guilt lie of the victorious powers, a personality very much opposite in ideology to the republican ("Weimar") government. On 18 September 1927, Reich president Paul von Hindenburg, a man who as General Field Marshal had been the liberator of East Prussia from Russian occupation in the battle of Tannenberg at the beginning of the first world war, ceremoniously denounced the Versailles war guilt lie before the entire world. Barnes had been the herald of that!

Since then, this denunciation has been proven a hundred times over as consistent with historical truth and has been internationally recognized.

We Germans have thus had (successful!) "experience" in fighting lies! But **how different** the situation is today. First of all, a "peace treaty" with Germany has still not been concluded. Instead, an armistice status still exists. For during and after the first world war, world "public opinion" has become a hundred times more "refined" and has assumed the most virulent form. The treaties with the western powers led to the establishment of the Federal Republic of Germany and moved Prof. Theodor Eschenburg of the University of Tübingen (since retired) to declare that "the thesis of Germany's exclusive guilt for the second world war is the foundation of every Bonn policy." Thus, Bonn places an ideology based upon the thesis of "liberation" from National Socialism **above** the historical truth. What a contrast to "Weimar"!

"A double stitch holds better," we say. To that lie has been added the lie about six million dead Jews, which appears to be the main theme of your conference.

The six million lie had been planned much longer ago than is realized by many of the most enthusiastic of those who

fight it. So also was the worldwide propaganda machine which today, particularly in Germany, cements the lie more and more. See the enclosed photocopy from *Gefesselte Justiz/Die Krankheit Unserer Zeit (Chained Justice–the Sickness of our Times)*, by Prof. Dr. Friedrich Grimm. He reports on a conversation with an enemy propagandist (who was probably Sefton Delmer). Everyone must take **that** to heart and take it into account if there is to be any successful defense against the second world war guilt lie and the six million lie.

The powers who lie have learned from their defeat in their attempt to falsify history after the first world war. Therefore, in response to their immeasurably sharper methods, equally **new** and equally effective **methods** for the **truth** must be found and applied.

I should mention that the "stages" upon which the efforts at resistance against the six million lie are to be played include the stifling and persecution, and so forth, of individual fighters for truth. The enclosed photocopy from *Die Welt* of 31 October 1979 reports what may be the latest effort: "In a fundamental decision, the Federal Supreme Court has defined the act which constitutes defamation: Whoever terms genocide ficticious. . ."

There must also be a way to fight judicially against the claim (which is apparently not explained in detail in the decision) that the documentation for the annihilation of millions of Jews is "overwhelming." Admittedly, as a simple man of the people and, as mentioned before, a non-academician, I can't advise as to the way to go about doing this.

In any case, we Germans will have to rely even more upon the efforts of non-German fighters for truth than was the case after 1918-19. Especially because they are not subject to the restrictions of German historians, their truths must not only be published, but must be made available to the widest possible circles in Germany using the methods and techniques which apply best to this people (which means paying attention to details such as book format, the best possible German translations, etc.).

One really underhanded method now being used is the

well-known practice of placing otherwise irrefutable books on the "Index of writings dangerous to youth" which hold up historical truth against the claims of Bonn (and, of course, East Berlin as well). They know very well what the consequences of that are for the publishers. Those in Bonn also believe that this indexing of books is in harmony with Article 5 of our Basic Law (constitution) regarding freedom of expression!! (As an individual, I don't know how to deal with this situation.) Nevertheless, please consider the following thoughts and the possibility of putting them into effect:

Over 450 years ago the Catholic Church placed the "Five Books on the Movements of Heavenly Bodies" written by the (German) astronomer Nicholas Copernicus on the Index of Prohibited Writings. (He let them be published only just before his death, but they have long since become the common heritage of all educated persons!) For 300 years this prohibition was maintained. And even when Kepler reconfirmed the Copernican thesis a century later, the Church continued to deny it for centuries! One may ask today, **was** it really **so** important for the Church to suppress the findings of Copernicus? It was, after all, only an (admittedly explicable) **mistake** maintained for centuries!! **Today**, however, known **lies** are maintained using an Index—namely those about six million gassed Jews!

A change in technique for the worse: The war guilt lies of 1918-19 contrasted with those of 1945, **and** the search for truth **450 years ago** as contrasted with **today!**

But this is also evidence for the importance of using **new** methods to fight the lies! During the past 30 years, it should have been possible to constantly strengthen the resistance against the lies, but that shows that it must not take another 300 years before the liars capitulate!

Best regards
Otto Kanold

Summary of Attachment #1

(Photocopy of pp146-48 from *Politische Justiz* by Prof. Dr. Friedrich Grimm, first published in 1953.)

Prof. Grimm relates a conversation from 1945 with "an important representative of the other (Allied) side" who "introduced himself as a university professor of his country." The two discussed the Allied atrocity propaganda against Germany, which the Allied professor admitted was not factual. The Allied professor said that the real atrocity propaganda campaign would begin now that the war was over and would be progressively intensified "until no one would ever again accept a good word about the Germans, until every last bit of sympathy which had been held in other countries would be completely destroyed, and until the Germans themselves would become so confused that they wouldn't know any longer what they were doing."

* * * * *

Summary of Attachment #2

(The article from *Die Welt* of 31 October 1979 contains extracts from the decision by the Federal Supreme Court (Bundesgerichtshof) regarding denials of the "Holocaust.")

The court ruled that "Whoever denies the murder of Jews in the Third Reich defames every one of them. Such statements apply, first of all, to those persons born after 1945 who, as full Jews or part Jews, would have been persecuted in the Third Reich." The court also ruled that statements denying the "Holocaust" are not protected under the constitutional guarantees of freedom of speech because such statements are untrue. "The documentation about the annihilation of millions of Jews is overwhelming."

The accused in this case put up a leaflet on a wall which called the "Holocaust" a "Zionist swindle." The accused conceded that some millions of Jews may have been killed, but that the claims about six million murdered Jews are unfounded. The court declared that the action by the accused was defamatory, regardless of how many Jews died, because it "attacked the image of the human as a personality" in much the same way as was done in the "Third Reich."

The court further ruled that, because of the Nürnberg (ra-

cial preservation) Laws which "robbed humans of their individuality," "a special relationship between Jews living in the Federal Republic (of Germany) and their fellow citizens has been created. Within this context the action (under review) is relevant today."

The court further ruled that it must be "taken for granted" that "a special moral responsibility by all others exists" towards the Jews. This responsibility is a part of the dignity of every Jew, the court stated. "For the person so affected, this means the continuation of the discrimination against the group of human beings to which he/she belongs, and thus directly against his/her own person. . . "

"The attempt to justify, whitewash or deny these events (the "Holocaust") also means disrespect for that (affected) person."

* * * * *

The Mendacity of Zion

LEWIS BRANDON

Professor Butz in his book has commented on the remarkable similarity between modern "Holocaust" lore and ancient Talmudic fantasies. On pp246-7 of *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century* he reports that the Talmud claims that the Romans slew 4 billion, "or as some say" 40 million, Jews. The blood of the Jewish victims was so great that it became a tidal wave, carrying boulders out to sea, and staining the water for four miles out. The bodies of the Jews were used as fence-posts, and their blood as fertilizer for the Roman vineyards. The Jewish children were wrapped up in their Torah scrolls and burned alive—all 64 million of them, or as some say, 150,000.

Some Exterminationist authors have admitted that at least some aspects of the myth are untrue. In *The Final Solution* (Sphere, London, 1971) art-dealer Gerald Reitlinger comments on page 581:

> A certain degree of reserve is necessary in handling all this material [documentary evidence], and particularly this applies to the last section [survivor narratives]. For instance, the evidence concerning the Polish death camps was mainly taken after the war by Polish State Commissions or by the Central Jewish Historical Commission of Poland. The hardy survivors who were examined were seldom educated men. Moreover, the Eastern European Jew is a natural rhetorician, speaking in flowery similes. When a witness said that the victims from the remote West reached the death camp in *Wagons-Lits* [Pullman cars], he probably meant that passenger coaches were used instead of box-cars. Sometimes the imagery transcends credibility, as when a gang of food-smugglers in a ghetto are described as exceptionally tall men with pockets running the whole length of their bodies. Thus readers, who are by no means afflicted with race prejudice,

> but who find the details of the murder on the national scale too appalling to assimilate, are inclined to cry *Credat Judaeus Apella* and dismiss these narratives as fables. The witnesses, they will say, are Orientals, who use numerals as oratorical adjectives and whose very names are creations of fantasy; Sunschein and Zylberdukaten, Rotbalsam and Salamander.

In her extraordinarily candid book *Eichmann in Jerusalem* (Penguin, 1978), journalist Hannah Arendt reports on page 207 that at the Eichmann trial, the prosecution

> had been under considerable pressure from Israeli survivors, who constitute about 20% of the present population of the country. They had flocked spontaneously to the trial authorities and also to Yad Vashem, which had been officially commissioned to prepare some of the documentary evidence, to offer themselves as witnesses. The worst cases of "strong imagination," people who had "seen Eichmann at various places where he had never been," were weeded out, but 56 "sufferings-of-the-Jewish-people witnesses," as the trial authorities called them, were finally put on the stand, instead of some 15 or 20 "background witnesses," as originally planned. 23 sessions, out of a total of 121, were entirely devoted to "background," which meant that they had no apparent bearing upon the case.

(Eichmann, of course, was not allowed to present any live witnesses in his defense, since the Israeli government had threatened to arrest as a war criminal any German defense witness who set foot on Israeli soil. They also refused to allow witness subpoenas for two El Al officers who could give evidence about Eichmann's abduction.) One wonders whether the prosecution did such a thorough job in "weeding out" those with "strong imaginations" for a few pages later Ms. Arendt describes how one witness who gave his name as "K-Zetnik" ("Jailbird" or "Camp Inmate") started to venture into an excursion into the astrological aspects of the Holocaust. He testified that the astrological stars were "influencing our fate in the same way as the star of ashes at Auschwitz is there facing our planet; radiating toward our planet." After allowing the witness to continue in this manner for some time, the presiding judge finally intervened to stop his ramblings, whereupon the witness fainted. Accord-

ing to Arendt, this man was also the author of several high-browed books on Auschwitz which dealt with the camp brothels, homosexuality, and other human interest sagas (pp223-4). Another verbose witness was Abba Kovner, the Israeli poet, who "had not so much testified as addressed an audience." When he was also interrupted by the judge in full flow, he upbraided the judge for daring to interfere with his artistry. Chassidic Jews claim that Kovner was not a partisan during the war, but a Nazi collaborator (see Shonfeld, *The Holocaust Victims Accuse*).

Even the witnesses who were supposed to give proper evidence turned out to be a waste of time. Ms. Arendt reveals on page 208 that

> If Eichmann's name was mentioned at all, it obviously was hearsay evidence, "rumors testified to," hence without legal validity. The testimony of all witnesses who had "seen him with their own eyes" collapsed the moment a question was addressed to them.

The whole Eichmann affair is stereotypical of the ethics of Zionists. Not only was the trial rigged from beginning to end, but his initial abduction was an even more blatant example of bare-faced lying. When the Argentinian government protested to Israel about their agents violating Argentinian sovereignty by kidnapping Eichmann on their soil, the Israelis blatantly lied. They claimed that the Israeli government had no knowledge of Eichmann's capture, since their Secret Service had not told them about it! They said that Eichmann had surrendered himself voluntarily, when recognized, and had given his agreement to come to Israel to stand trial. They even had the gall to include a "letter" signed by Eichmann where he stated that he wanted to be tried so that future generations would have a "correct" picture of WWII events. As Richard Harwood comments in *Nuremberg & Other War Crimes Trials* (IHR, $2.50) p52

> The Israeli statement was a pack of lies from beginning to end. Eichmann was not "approached by Jewish volunteers." He was bundled into a car in the street by Israeli secret service agents (David Ben-Gurion, *Israel: A Personal History*). He did not go to Israel of his own free will—his family spent the

> whole night searching for him after his abrupt disappearance. As for his so-called "letter to the Argentinian Government" it just defeats description.

Hannah Arendt suggests that the letter was written in Jerusalem, not in Argentina. She describes how Eichmann was kept tied to a bed for eight days after his kidnapping (p241). Whatever the location of its origination, Richard Harwood cynically comments that "Eichmann's 'confession' could not have been better written if the Israelis had written it themselves—as seems most likely."

The lies churned out by the Israeli government surrounding the Eichmann abduction were very small beer compared to their behavior in 1967, when Israeli marines torpedoed and strafed an American intelligence ship, the USS *Liberty*. 34 Americans were killed in the raid, and the ship was so badly damaged it had to be scrapped. The attack was personally ordered by General Moshe Dayan, who did not want Israel's imperialist war plans to become documented by the American spy ship. There would be no telling where the information would end up. Dayan wanted Israel to appear to the world as the underdog, whereas in reality the Israelis were hatching expansionist plans for the invasion of Syria and the Sinai and Jordan.

The attack took place in broad daylight. The ship was reconnoitered 8 times for 6 hours before the attack by Israeli aircraft. The ship was flying a large and prominent American flag. Yet the Israelis had the nerve to pretend that the whole attack had been an accident. They claimed that they had mistaken the vessel for an Egyptian one. In his new book *Assault on the Liberty* (available from IHR at $14), crewman James Ennes describes the astonishing denials and cover up. He produces CIA documents that prove that the Israelis knew what they were doing. He also proves how the Israeli excuses do not coincide with the facts. Yet, to this day, Israel maintains that the attack was an "error" and this outrageous calumny is meekly accepted by our so-called "representatives" in Washington.

Of course, this was the second time that Dayan had escaped by the skin of his teeth from being publicly exposed as a murderer of Americans. In 1955, a plot to bomb Ameri-

can libraries and theaters in Cairo was revealed. The bombers were Jewish Egyptians who had been trained in Israel by the Mossad. The intention of the plot was to blame the bombings on Egypt, and thus sour American-Egyptian relations. When the plan backfired, Pinhas Lavon, the Israeli Minister of Defense, was forced to resign. But he was only the "fall guy" for the plot's failure. The murder scheme had been drawn up by Moshe Dayan along with Shimon Peres and Brigadier Abraham Givli. They were able to blame Lavon only by framing him with a forged document. An internal Israeli investigation five years later showed that the document had been faked, and this revelation so rocked the country that it led to the resignation of the entire Ben-Gurion government in 1961. The "dirty tricks" of Dayan, both in hatching the murder plot in the first place, and then framing his colleague when found out, are described in the recently reprinted indictment of Zionism, *The Zionist Connection* by the distinguished Jewish scholar Alfred Lilienthal (available from IHR at $21). Further details can be found in *The Decadence of Judaism in Our Time* by Moshe Menuhin (IHR $13).

Lilienthal also deals with the SS *Patria* affair in 1940. The ship was full of illegal Jewish immigrants to Palestine, but was refused docking permission at Haifa harbor by the British. They ordered it out to sea again. Then on the night of 25 November, the ship blew up and 276 Jews were killed. At the time, these deaths were attributed to the British, but it was not until ten years later that the truth finally came out. David Flinker, Israeli correspondent of the New York *Morning Freiheit* reported on 27 November 1950 that the bombs had been planted by the Haganah, the Zionist terrorist organization. The idea was, yet again, to blame the deaths on the enemy and make the Zionists out to be the poor martyred ones. Fifteen months later, the SS *Struma* exploded in the Black Sea, killing 769 illegal Jewish immigrants. The Jewish Agency described it as an act of "mass-protest and mass-suicide," although it seems somewhat doubtful if all 769 victims were polled. The American newspapers once more laid the responsibility at the door of the British.

Even today, it seems that very little has changed. The Zionists are still up to their usual dirty tricks; trying to make themselves out to be the underdogs and the victims. Sandra

Ross in *The Nation Wreckers* (available from IHR at $3) describes how many of the outbreaks of swastika-daubing in Britain in the 1950s and '60s were the work of Communists and Zionists. Lilienthal also describes how Zionism thrives on "anti-Semitism." *The New York Times* (16 September 1979) reports that a Jewish businessman was arrested for insurance fraud, after his own building burned down and swastikas and the slogan "Jews Get Out" were found painted on the walls. The London *Jewish Chronicle* (21 September 1979) reports an incident in Long Island, NY, where a large swastika was burned into the lawn of a Jewish family. Another Jew was later arrested for the offense.

Letters To The 'New Statesman' (which were never published)

MESSRS. BUTZ, FAURISSON, VERRALL

The following letters were mailed to the editor of the *New Statesman*, 10 Great Turnstile, London WC1V 7HJ, Great Britain, following the publication of an article attacking Revisionism on 2 November 1979, by Gitta Sereny.

18 November 1979

Dear Sir:

In general Gitta Sereny's few substantive arguments (*NS*, 2 November) are answered in my book *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*. Here I wish to focus on one point that, in view of her remarks, can be profitably developed: supposed "confessions" of German officials, either at trials or in imprisonment after trials.

The key point is that the objective served by such statements should be presumed to be personal interest rather than historical truth. At a "trial" some specific thing is to be **tried**, i.e. the court is supposed to start by treating that thing as an open question.

The "extermination" allegation has never been at question in any practical sense in any of the relevant trials, and in some it has not been open to question in a formal legal sense. The question was always only personal responsibility in a context in which the extermination allegation was unquestionable. Thus the "confessions" of Germans, which in all cases sought to deny or mitigate personal responsibility, were merely the only defenses they could present in their circumstances.

This is not exactly "plea-bargaining", where there is negotiation between prosecution and defense, but it is re-

lated. All it amounts to is presenting a story that it was possible for the court to accept. The logical dilemma is inescapable once the defendant resolves to take the "trial" seriously. To deny the legend was not the way to stay out of jail.

Moreover it is not true, as Sereny implicitly asserts, that this logical dilemma no longer holds when the defendant is serving a life sentence. If he is seeking pardon or parole, he would not try to overturn what has already been decided in court; that is not the way pardon or parole works. For example, at the Frankfurt "Auschwitz trial" of 1963-1965, so monstrous were the supposed deeds of Robert Mulka that many thought his sentence to 14 years at hard labor unduly light. Then, in a denouement that would amaze all who have not studied this subject closely, Mulka was quietly released less than four months later. However, if Mulka had claimed in any plea (as he could have truthfully), either at his trial or afterwards, that there were no exterminations at Auschwitz and that he was in a position to know, then he would have served a full life sentence in the former case and the full fourteen years in the latter, if he lived that long.

It is not widely known, but there have been many such instances—the subject is hard to investigate.[1] In no instance would it have made any sense, in terms of immediate self interest, to deny the exterminations. That was not the way to get out of jail.

A related point is that it can be quite perilous, to put it mildly, for **any** German to question the Extermination legend. For example Dr. Wilhelm Stäglich, who was stationed near Auschwitz in 1944 in an anti-aircraft unit, has published such opinion, and has been subjected to legally formulated persecution ever since.[2] Even I, an American, have been the victim of the official repression in Germany.[3] There is also the considerable extra-legal repression that e.g. caused Axel Springer, West German "press czar" and supposedly a powerful man, to withdraw the first edition of Hellmut Diwald's *Geschichte der Deutschen*, as Sereny mentioned.

We do not need "confessions" or "trials" to determine that the bombings of Dresden and Hiroshima, or the reprisals at Lidice following Heydrich's assassination, really took place.

Now, the extermination legend does not claim a few instances of homicide, but alleges events continental in geographical scope, of three years in temporal scope, and of several million in scope of victims. How ludicrous, then, is the position of the bearers of the legend, who in the last analysis will attempt to "prove" such events on the basis of "confessions" delivered under the fabric of hysteria, censorship, intimidation, persecution and blatant illegality that has been shrouding this subject for 35 years.

I have enclosed photocopies of the referenced documentation for your examination.

Sincerely

Dr. Arthur R. Butz

(1) *Los Angeles Herald Examiner*, 2 September 1979, pE2.
(2) *Die Zeit*, 25 May 1979, p5.
(3) *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 16 June 1979, p23.

*****

10 November 1979

Sir:

I am grateful for Gitta Sereny's contribution to Holocaust Revisionism, since her article (*NS* 2 November) did what I originally insisted to Messrs Ainzstein and Wheen had to be done, namely confront and debate this issue. It is therefore enormously significant that Miss Sereny now concedes that gassings in Germany were "a myth," that those who died in camps in Germany "were not exterminated," that Auschwitz "was not primarily an extermination camp" (completely contradicting the Nürnberg judgement that it was "set aside for this main purpose"), that "mistakes have been made" which must be explained and corrected, and that some testimonies have been "partial or complete fakes." This is real progress.

Essentially what Miss Sereny has been forced to do, under

the impact of Revisionism, is to narrow down the alleged extermination program to only four camps at Chelmno, Belzec, Sobibor and Treblinka; camps which no longer exist and for which documentary evidence of gassings is supplied only by the notorious Gerstein Statement. This document, which contradicts Miss Sereny's own thesis by claiming that Auschwitz was the worst of the extermination camps, contains absurd and impossible nonsense such as that the Nazis gassed **25 million** people and that 700-800 victims were crammed into gas chambers 25 meters square (in which case they would have died from suffocation first). It also describes a visit by Hitler to an extermination camp which even Reitlinger admits never took place.

This palpable fraud is the sole document attesting to gassings at the four camps mentioned by Miss Sereny, and presumably is also the source for her view that gas chamber exterminations at these camps "evolved" from the euthanasia program. Auschwitz, of course, would have to be excluded from this evolution, since the testimony of Höss (accepted as valid by Miss Sereny) gives a completely different account of the origin of the gassings. This curious break in the structure of the story does not appear to worry her.

Miss Sereny makes an unsuccessful effort to counter my claim that no order, invoice, plan or blueprint for a gas chamber exists. What I wanted was proof of construction. Is it not remarkable that, although there are thousands of documents relating to the construction of crematoria, including invoices accurate almost to the last pfennig, one cannot find a single order for construction, or a plan or an invoice or a photograph of a gas chamber? Is it not amazing that we know nothing of these gas chambers, such prodigious weapons of murder, that testimony about them is so wildly contradictory, and that they have not been made the subject of the most scrupulous archaeological and scientific examination?

In the absence of such a document, Miss Sereny cites NO-365. This is a typed draft of a letter, and it has a very suspicious history. It is apparently initialled by Dr. Wetzel, a member of Rosenberg's Ministry. Wetzel is one of the many mysterious cases of minor officials whose initialled documents constituted trial evidence but who themselves became

immune from prosecution. He was not arrested until 1961, but no trial ever materialized. He had lived undisturbed until that time because he had supplied Reitlinger with material which gave credence to the gas chamber thesis of his book *The Final Solution*. "In the opinion of the authorities Wetzel was indebted for his incognito, which lasted for years, to the British historian Gerald Reitlinger . . ." (*Allgäuer Anzeigeblatt*, 18 August 1961). In other words, we doubtless have here another fabrication after the event, like the Gerstein Statement.

I was not impressed by Miss Sereny's attempt to dismiss the academic standing of Revisionists by stressing that Faurrison is a professor of French literature, Butz a professor of engineering and that Diwald, though a historian, is a mediaevalist. May I point out that none of the so-called experts on the Holocaust are historians. Reitlinger is an art expert and Hilberg is a sociologist.

Finally, I would like to ask Miss Sereny, in what precise way does the "mountain of evidence" proving that gas chambers were operated in Poland differ from the mountain of evidence presented at military tribunals to prove that there had been gas chambers in camps in Germany where it is now admitted there had been none?

Yours faithfully

Richard Verrall

*****

30 November 1979

Dear Sir:

re: *"The Men Who Whitewash Hitler," 2 November 1979*

Noam Chomsky, the famous professor (of Jewish origin) at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, is aware of the research work I do on what Revisionist Historians term "the gas chamber and genocide hoax." He informed me that Gitta Sereny had mentioned my name in the above article, and

stated that I had been referred to "in an extraordinarily unfair way."

I have just read the article in question, and it is an insult to all those who—without political motivation—devote themselves to the discovery of historical truth, by means of routine historical research. It is a special insult and outrage to the memory of my fellow countryman Paul Rassinier, himself a former concentration camp inmate who died in 1967. Rassinier sacrificed his life to the service of truth, and to the denunciation of an enormous historical lie.

"There is no proof whatsoever that Nero set fire to Rome." The historian who first said that did not want to "whitewash" Nero; he was only concerned with the truth. In the same way, we do not try to "whitewash" Hitler when we say that there is not the slightest proof that he ordered the "extermination" of the Jews; or even that such "extermination" took place. Certainly persecution existed; but there was no "extermination," "genocide" or "Holocaust."

Gitta Sereny is unable to offer a single item of evidence to the contrary. She does mention Nürnberg document NO-365, but this "document" is not even signed, and is therefore worthless as evidence. She mentions the "Commissar Order"; but clearly she has not read the document, for the meaning of it is not what she thinks. She ought to take a look at NOKW-1076. She goes on to mention the "Aktion Reinhardt," but again, this does not imply any mass killing; it merely refers to the confiscation of the property of deported Jews.

She quotes a letter published in *Die Zeit*, written by Professor Broszat. Again, one wonders if she read this letter, for it is dated 19 August 1960, not 1962. It appears on page 16. This letter states quite clearly that there were **no** mass killings in "gas chambers" either in Dachau or anywhere else in the former Reich. May I remind you that up until 1960 we were supposed to have thousands of proofs, confessions, and eye-witness evidence, that there were mass killings at Dachau, Ravensbrück, Buchenwald, and so on. Therefore, we now have to acknowledge that the authors of such confessions (Suhren, Schwarzhuber, Dr. Treite...) must have been subjected to "persuasive questioning" on the part of their

French, British, and American jailers. This should give food for thought, at least as far as the "confessions" are concerned.

Rudolf Höss (not to be confused with Rudolf Hess, still imprisoned in Spandau) was one of the three successive commandants of Auschwitz. He is the only one to have left "confessions." These "confessions" are preposterous in the extreme. Besides the Treblinka and Belzec camps, he has invented a third camp at Wolzek—a place which cannot be found on any map of Poland! Höss was handed over to the Polish authorities by the British. After a travesty of justice masquerading as a trial, he was hanged. But while he was awaiting death, his communist jailers allowed him write his "confessions" in the best traditions of the Moscow show-trials.

To explain away the contradictions and the absurdities of his earlier declarations to the British interrogators, the communists allowed him to recall that he had been tortured by the British Field Security Police "with riding-whip and alcohol" and then tortured some more by a British major, who was also a magistrate, at Minden-on-Weser. Höss signed his affidavit (PS-3868) for the British on 5 April 1946—an affidavit written in American-English, which there is no evidence he could understand. Ten days later, Höss appeared as a witness before the International Military Tribunal at Nürnberg, and his "evidence" on Auschwitz astonished the entire world. In actual fact, this "evidence" was not uttered by Höss himself, but consisted of an American prosecutor reading to him selected passages from his affidavit, and Höss blankly answering "Yes." According to many people, Höss was in a state of "schizophrenic apathy."

Regarding the tortures systematically inflicted on the German soldiers and officers by the Allies, one should read Sir Reginald Paget's book *Manstein: His Campaign & His Trial* (Collins, 1951). On page 109 one finds that the (U.S.) Simpson Inquiry Commission "reported among other things that of the 139 cases they had investigated, 137 had had their testicles permanently destroyed by kicks received from the American War Crimes Investigating Team."

But torture is not the only way history can be distorted. Many journalists and other writers simply pretend that the

accused has made statements which they never in fact made! To give one example, the general public believes that Sergeant Franz Gustav Wagner has cynically declared at Sao Paulo: "At Sobibor we used to gas thousands of people, and this did not disturb me in the least: it was my job." However, a paper like *Le Monde,* which is sometimes well-informed, has revealed that in fact Wagner had declared he had never taken part in any assassination of Jews or any other inmate, but that he was only doing his job. As you see, some journalists have decided that "his job" was killing people.

The journalists who do not care about truth are simply following the lead of the judges and magistrates in every country (particularly Western Germany) who, for the past 35 years, have taken it upon themselves to judge "war criminals" (a phrase thought up by the victors to apply only to the vanquished). The Nürnberg International Tribunal itself has given us a model of this indifference to the truth. Here are some extracts from its statutes:

Article 19: "The Tribunal shall not be bound by technical rules of evidence (. . .)"
Article 21: "The Tribunal shall not require proof of facts of common knowledge, but shall take judicial notice thereof (. . .)"

The Institute for Historical Review, PO Box 1306, Torrance, California 90505, USA, has offered a reward of $50,000 to anyone who can bring definite proof that the Germans used "gas chambers" to kill Jews. Gitta Sereny might be interested.

Zyklon B is hydrocyanic acid; still used in France to disinfect ships. It adheres strongly to surfaces. To enter a place which has been disinfected with it, one has to wait nearly 24 hours for natural aeration (not ventilation). Now, here is my question: How could the members of the "Sonderkommando" enter the lethal "gas chamber" immediately after the death of the victims, and while eating and drinking; that is to say, if I understand correctly, without even a gas mask? How could they pull out with their bare hands the thousands of

cyanided corpses drenched in an atmosphere of hydrocyanic acid? How could they cut hair, pull out teeth and so on, when in an American prison gas chamber there are 40 operations which need to be done (including partial neutralization of hydrocyanic acid by ammonia) before going into the cubicle with gas masks, rubber gloves, and apron, in order to carefully clean the corpse so that the doctor and his assistants should not be poisoned? If the Germans had not cared about the health of the "Sonderkommando" members, these men would have died on the spot, and so the "gas chamber" would never have received its next batches of victims.

The aerial photographs of Auschwitz recently published by the CIA show that everything is in complete contradiction with everything we have been told by the so-called eyewitnesses, about crowds of people waiting to be murdered, and the heavy smoke perpetually rising from the crematorium chimneys.

As for Sobibor and Treblinka, one should read Ms. Sereny's own book *Into That Darkness* (André Deutsch, 1974). In 70 hours of talks with Franz Stangl, Ms. Sereny did not ask one question about the technicalities of the "gas chambers." What kind of gas? What mechanism for gassing? What chemical process? How many victims? How was it possible to enter right away? There is not even one shred of evidence, nor one item of proof, that even one "gas chamber" existed in either Sobibor or Treblinka. Ms. Sereny does not even give the real plans of the camps!

I am neither a former Nazi, nor a neo-Nazi. I hate fascism and any form of persecution. But because I have declared that the "gas chambers" and "genocide" are one and the same historical lie, I have been subjected to abuse, I have been assaulted, I cannot give lectures in my university (even though the behavior of my own students has been perfectly correct), I am prosecuted. My life has become most difficult, but it does have purpose, and I know that I shall go my own way. It is my duty.

Robert Faurisson

17 January 1980

Dear Sir:

I am writing to ask you why you have not published any of the letters you received from people whose views were deprecated and misrepresented in Gitta Sereny's quite lengthy article of 2 November 1979.

Intellectual honesty, as well as ordinary decency, requires that you grant such people a right of reply. Refusal to grant that right constitutes dishonorable, or more specifically cowardly, journalism.

Sincerely

Dr. Arthur R. Butz

*****

24 January 1980

Dear Butz,

Letters from Verrall and other sympathizers of yours were not published by the New Statesman because in my opinion they—like you—have some time ago excluded themselves from the decencies of intellectual debate. It would make no more sense to enter the intellectual debate with you than it would have done to do so with Goebbels.

Yours sincerely,

Bruce Page
Editor
New Statesman

Winston Spencer Churchill: A Tribute

HARRY ELMER BARNES

No informed person could well deny that Winston S. Churchill was probably the most spectacular showman in the history of British politics, and he was surely one of Britain's great masters of patriotic and honorific rhetoric. But when we go beyond this into any phase of Churchill's career we enter debatable ground. Any careful study of his personality and career raises serious questions as to his personal and political integrity and the value of his public services to Great Britain.

His political career revealed no firm political principles or ideology. He shifted in his party affiliations from the Conservatives to the Liberals and back to the Conservatives. He praised Mussolini and Hitler lavishly after their totalitarian programs had been fully established and their operations were well known. He said that if he had been an Italian he would have been a Fascist, and as late as 1938 he stated that if England were ever in the same straits that Germany had been in 1933, he hoped that England would find "her Hitler." The eminent Anglo-American publicist, Francis Neilson, declared that Churchill's praise of Hitler was the most extreme tribute ever paid by a prominent Englishman to the head of a foreign state. When his "great and good friend" of former days, Mussolini, was murdered by Communist partisans and his corpse hung up head down in Milan, Churchill rushed in to a dinner party with the news, exclaiming: "Ah, the bloody beast is dead!" In World War II he declared that it was his great life purpose to destroy Hitler and National Socialism.

Churchill's shifts on Communism were equally fantastic. He had been one of the most bitter critics of Communism and its leaders, denouncing it as "foul baboonery," but during World War II he extolled Stalin as generously as he previously had Mussolini and Hitler, only to shift again as early as 1946 and demand a Cold War on Communism.

There is no convincing evidence whatever that Churchill ever proposed or supported any public measure with a primary interest in its probable effect on the welfare of Britain or humanity. He appeared to be exclusively concerned with its probable reaction on his own political career. In this he differed from Roosevelt. Even John T. Flynn admits that the latter, as a country squire, had a real sense of *noblesse oblige* and was interested in the well-being of the common people when helping them did not interfere with his own political ambitions. Churchill never revealed any sense of *noblesse oblige*. To him rank only demanded special privileges and rewards. It would hardly be an exaggeration to say that he was the most vain person in the whole history of prominent public figures, a trait enduring until his death and after, when he had planned years or months in advance even the details of a pompous and dramatic public funeral.

Churchill was completely lacking in integrity with respect to his public career. He had no hesitation in uttering the most flagrant misstatements when this appeared necessary to him to promote his political ambitions or cover up his past mistakes. He did not turn aside from deceiving the British people on matters of great public import if this was required for his political self-protection. Perhaps the best of many examples was his report to the House of Commons after his return from the disastrous Yalta Conference, where he had witnessed Stalin's duplicity and mendacious greed, having already observed this at Tehran and in the atrocious violation of Stalin's promises in regard to the Soviet treatment of Poland. Churchill assured the House: "The impression I brought back from the Crimea is that Marshall Stalin and the other Soviet leaders wish to live in honorable friendship and democracy with the Western democracies. I feel that no government stands more on its obligations than the Russian Soviet Government."

It is well to remember that Churchill's great current reputation as a statesman rests entirely on events between April 1940 and July 1945. He was so thoroughly discredited as a politician by 1933 that both the Baldwin and Chamberlain governments considered that to have him in the Cabinet

would be a detriment to Conservative prestige and prospects. When public issues returned again to domestic affairs in 1945, Churchill was resoundingly defeated in the General Election of that summer. As a wartime administrator he showed tremendous energy rather than organizing and directive genius. He was more distinguished for his pugnacity than for his statecraft, although there can be no doubt that he inspired the British to unite and continue the war against Hitler, but it may be questioned if unthinking resistance to Hitler after Dunkirk was the best policy for Britain. The most effective indictment of Churchill's wartime statecraft is that after gaining military victory he lost the peace to Soviet Russia.

There has been no greater fallacy than to regard Churchill as a military genius, although it is probable that no other important British leader has so loved war or worked harder to insure it when it seemed within the range of possibility. Churchill was responsible for the disastrous attempt to force the Dardanelles in 1915, which was Britain's most spectacular defeat in the World War I (except for the futile attempts to break through the German trenches). It has been said that it was a good plan if it had worked, but a truly good military plan must work out in practice and not merely be impressive on paper. Both Lord Fisher and Lord Kitchener warned against the project. Churchill was compelled to resign as responsible for the failure.

In regard to World War II both English and American experts have indicated that Churchill's interference in strategic decisions was often disastrous. General Albert C. Wedemeyer has pointed out that Churchill and Roosevelt really ran military operations like a pair of Indian chiefs conducting a scalping party, with little consideration of the ultimate military or political outcome. Churchill's constant demand to concentrate the Allied attack against the "soft underbelly of Europe"—a sort of return to the Dardanelles fantasy—was properly discredited by the impressive manner in which General Kesserling defended the Italian sector of the soft underbelly under the greatest handicaps, defeated in the end mainly by the treachery of Hitler and his SS underlings.

It is held even by restrained admirers of Churchill that we must at least give him credit for saving Britain. One might ask: saving Britain from whom and from what? Hitler was a worse bootlicker of Britain than the Kaiser and the cornerstone of his foreign policy was to achieve a permanent understanding with Britain. Even after Dunkirk, where he deliberately permitted the British to escape, he offered Britain a generous peace and told his generals that he would put the **German Wehrmacht, air force and navy** at the service of Britain to preserve the British Empire. Real statesmanship would have dictated Churchill's agreeing to a stalemate with Germany in June 1941, and letting Germany and Russia bleed each other white and thus remove the threat of dictatorship from either the Right or the Left. This was what wise Americans like Herbert Hoover, Robert A. Taft, and Harry S. Truman recommended at the time. But Churchill was just getting too much joy and thrill—"having too much fun," as Roosevelt put it—out of being an active war leader to consider for a moment retiring to the role of an observer, even if this was probably the only way to assure British safety and the preservation of the Empire. He condemned England to four more years of costly and brutal warfare, failed to protect eastern and central Europe from Russia and Communism, and made inevitable the liquidation of the British Empire.

Churchill led in the denunciation of the alleged horrible atrocities and brutalities of the Nazis, but his record is surely no better. He rejected Hitler's proposal at the outset of the War to ban all bombardment of non-military objectives and launched this barbarous form of bombing on 11 May 1940, with an attack on the helpless university town of Freiburg. He announced that he would stop at no type or extent of brutality and terrorism to crush Hitler and he made good his word. He directed the terrible incendiary bombing of Hamburg, and was solely responsible for ordering the needless destruction of the beautiful city of Dresden, the most ruthless, despicable and indefensible major atrocity of World War II, in which the losses of life and property were far greater than in the case of the American bombing of either Hiroshima or Nagasaki. He approved and ordered the appli-

cation of the Lindemann Plan for the saturation bombing of Germany which, for stark brutality in both conception and operation, matched any of the alleged Nazi "extermination" measures. This plan ordered concentration of British bombing on the homes of the poorer or working classes whose houses were huddled close together so that more innocent civilians could be killed per bomb that was dropped.

In his remarks at the funeral of Mr. Churchill, former-President Dwight Eisenhower laid main stress on Churchill's achievements as a "friend of peace." It would be no exaggeration to say that this was not unlike J. Edgar Hoover paying a special tribute to Al Capone as a friend of law enforcement. Even his British admirers have conceded Churchill's lifelong and inordinate love of war. No other British public figure worked as hard to bring Britain into World War I as did Churchill. This has been admitted in the recent book, *Twelve Days*, by the English writer George Malcolm Thomson on the crisis of 1914. It is common knowledge that Churchill was the leader of the British war party from 1936 onward, having told General Robert E. Wood in that year that: "Germany is getting too strong; we must smash her." He not only cooperated with the war party in Britain but also worked closely with Bernard Baruch and the other powerful warminded Americans.

Perhaps the best summary appraisal of Churchill's personality comes from the distinguished British publicist, F.S. Oliver:

> From his youth up Mr. Churchill has loved with all his heart, with all his mind, with all his soul, and with all his strength, three things: war, politics and himself. He has loved war for its dangers, he loves politics for the same reason, and himself he has always loved for the knowledge that his mind is dangerous—dangerous to his enemies, dangerous to his friends, dangerous to himself. I can think of no man I have ever met who would so quickly and so bitterly eat his heart out in Paradise.

The significance of Churchill's career for this and later generations was admirably summarized by the British journal, *The European:*

In terms of personal success there has been no career more fortunate than that of Winston Churchill. In terms of human suffering to millions of people and destruction to the noble edifice of mankind there has been no career more disastrous. In that sad paradox lies the tragedy of our time.

Auschwitz Notebook

DITLIEB FELDERER

More impossibilities of the "Gerstein Statement"

The so-called "Gerstein Statement" continues to be the main evidence for the "Holocaust." The book *Holocaust* (New York, 1978) written by Gerald Green—on which the TV series of the same name was based—used the "Gerstein Statement" indirectly. The statement was also featured in evidence at both the Nürnberg Trials and the Jerusalem trial of Adolf Eichmann. Two different versions were used, which are reproduced in Paul Rassinier's *Debunking the Genocide Myth* (*142*: pp410-423). The Nürnberg version is also reproduced in Professor Butz's book *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century* (*109*: pp251-258). Both these excellent authors deal with the mystery surrounding the identity and death of Kurt Gerstein, and the discrepancies between the various statements attributed to him. But here, let us instead concentrate our attention on some of the contents.

Amongst other things, Gerstein states that a train with 45 cars which had arrived at Belzec contained "6,700 persons; 1,450 of whom were already dead on their arrival."

If so, each car must have held 148.9 persons on average (6,700 ÷ 45); for simplicity's sake let us say 150. As these 6,700 persons were prisoners, the number of guards and staff accompanying the train should be added, which would decrease the area per person even further; so much so, in fact, that one wonders if cramming people together like this would not be sufficient to kill all of them, thus saving the Germans the trouble of shipping them to the "death camps."

Is it in fact possible to squeeze over 150 people into one railroad car? We should not forget that the prisoners often carried big bundles with them, and we are told that on occasions even furniture went along (compare *142*: pp200-2 and pp360-6). In *Encyclopedia Judaica* under the heading "Belzec" a picture is presented which purports to show "Jews

in Zamosc waiting for deportation to the Belzec extermination camp" (1, *Vol.4;* p454). Observe here the bundles of belongings the Jews carry with them. At Treblinka, Gerstein claims there were mountains of clothes and underwear up to 40 meters high (see my analysis in JOURNAL OF HISTORICAL REVIEW, Spring 1980). A lot of wagons would have been needed just to transport all these belongings.

Gerstein is very confused. At first he claims that the Belzec "gas chambers" numbered "three garage-like rooms on each side, 4 x 5 meters large and 1.90 meters high." That would make a total of 6 "gas chambers" each having an area of 20 square meters. Further on he suggests that there were only 4 "gas chambers" at Belzec and that the area of each chamber was "25 square meters" or "45 cubic meters." Gerstein's mathematical skill reaches its usual low grade, for it is obvious that if the chambers measured 4 x 5 meters, the area would not be 25 square meters, but 20. And the cubic capacity would have been 38 cubic meters, not 45. Even if the area was "25 square meters" it still does not work out at "45 cubic meters" in capacity, but 47.5 (25 x 1.90).

What is even more amazing however, is the number of people who supposedly went into each chamber to be exterminated. A total of 700 to 800 people are supposed to have been placed in each chamber. The following table will illustrate what this literally means, using the wide range of figures for dimensions, which Gerstein uses throughout his "statement." From this table, we can truly agree with Gerstein that the people were literally "crushed together" which in reality should have made the gassing by Diesel fumes entirely unnecessary. (See table below).

NUMBER OF PEOPLE PER CHAMBER	SIZE OF CHAMBER IN m^2	cm^2 PER PERSON	SPACE PER PERSON IN CM.	PERSONS PER SQ. METER IF FORMED INTO A SQUARE
750	20	266.7	16.33 x 16.33	37.5
750	25	333.3	18.26 x 18.26	30
800	20	250	15.81 x 15.81	40
800	25	312.5	17.68 x 17.68	31.9

As can be seen from this table, the number of persons allotted to one square meter ranges from 30 to 40 people; that is, if we could mold each person into a square, allowing no space in between. From a practical viewpoint, it would be quite a job to get even six standing grown-ups into one square meter. The problem is further exacerbated by the fact that the room was only 1.90 meters (6'3") high. Any tall person, especially any still wearing shoes, would have to stoop. Even though six people would be the limit in these circumstances, Gerstein's know-how managed to cram in up to 40 people per square meter. He does admit that it was rather crowded in the chamber, but this remark is certainly a real exercise in understatement! And these calculations are all figured on the basis of people being a regular shape, and with no allowance for space in between!

Another curious observation we make with the "Gerstein Statement" is his mentioning how he could observe the victims dying and know when they had died. He writes: "Many of the people, it is true, are dead at that point. One can see this through the little window when the electric lamp reveals, for a moment, the inside of the chamber."

One wonders how it was that anything at all was visible through the "little window" considering so many people were crammed in there? All that would be visible would be somebody's back or chest squashed up against the window. The point about the electric light is so absurd that it makes the whole thing a complete nonsense.

Gerstein writes that "like stone statues, the dead are still standing, there having been no room to fall or bend over." Obviously if any person was taller than 1.90m (6'3") he would have had to bend over or stoop in order to get in! It would indeed be curious to know how Gerstein (with a stop-watch in hand, take note) could have possibly known whether or not the victims were dead, seeing as he is telling us they were all still standing! There is no way that a central light could have been seen from the window, or anything at all except the skin of the person nearest the door!

Let us finally return to the 5,250 people who survived the train ride from Lvov (6,700 less 1,450 = 5,250). We note that Gerstein claims only (!) 750 people were put into each chamber; despite the fact that they could hold up to 800,

according to his previous assertions. That would mean that 3,000 people (750 x 4) were put into each of the four chambers. But what then happened to the rest; some 2,250 people? If it was possible to crush 750 people into one chamber, then why not 1,313 people into each chamber (5,250 ÷ 4 = 1312.5)? If Gerstein is going to allege that the chamber was crammed with 40 people per square meter, then 75-odd people per square meter should not present too much of a problem to such a magician, should it?

In spite of all the absurdities, impossibilities, erroneous and contradictory figures, the "Gerstein Statement" continues to maintain its supremacy in Exterminationist lore. Perhaps this is just as well, from a cynical Revisionist viewpoint, for few things could better illustrate the mythical nature of the "Holocaust" than this very item.

References

The numbers used refer to the author's *Revisionist Bibliography* of almost 200 Revisionist and Exterminationist titles, which is available direct from the author. Those titles mentioned in this text are as follows:

1 *Encyclopedia Judaica*, Jerusalem, 16 volumes, 1971/2.
109 Arthur R. Butz, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, IHR, 1979.
142 Paul Rassinier, *Debunking the Genocide Myth*, IHR, 1979.

Book Reviews

NUREMBERG: A NATION ON TRIAL, Werner Maser, Scribners, 368pp, hardback, available from IHR at $18.00. ISBN: 0-684-16252-0.

This new book is easily the best so far on the hideous aberration of justice known as the "Nürnberg War Crimes Trials." The author is a well-known German historian; his biography of Hitler having been an international bestseller.

Many of the more repulsive aspects of Nürnberg which were brought to light in Richard Harwood's *Nuremberg & Other War Crimes Trials* (IHR $2.50) are underlined in this new book. This time, they are backed up with hard facts and figures, references and interviews. This book is the product of many years of painstaking research. To take just a few samples of Herr Maser's revelations:

When the ashes of the hanged were taken to a small river to be dumped, each urn bore a ficticious **Jewish** name (p12).

Hans Frank was beaten up by two colored GIs as soon as he was arrested (p47). So was Julius Streicher (p51), who was whipped and forced to drink negro saliva.

The simultaneous interpretation system at the trial was supplied free of charge by IBM, and was often inaccurate (p83).

Although the Trial Charter allowed defendants the right to represent themselves, Hess was not allowed to (p73).

The defense were not allowed to have copies of many prosecution documents of evidence (p97). Defense documents had to be sifted by the prosecution, before they could be submitted in court (p98). Many of their documents were confiscated or stolen.

Prosecution witnesses, such as Pohl, were beaten until they would give "correct" evidence (p100). Many defense witnesses were not allowed to appear at all.

Affidavits were allowed on the prosecution side, with no opportunity for the defense to cross-examine the authors. The Tribunal announced that it would "take judicial note" of anything which had "probative value" (p102).

Agreements to advise the defense of topics to be examined next day in court were dishonored and repudiated (p106). Agreements

to supply adequate copies and translations of documentary evidence were too (p104).

President Roosevelt himself intervened to prevent the truth coming out about Katyn (p113).

The hangings of the ten condemned Germans was bungled. Ribbentrop took ten minutes to die (p253). Jodl took 18 minutes, and Keitel 24 (p255). Streicher groaned for a long time after dropping, Frick had severe wounds on his face and neck, through striking the edge of the trap (p255). A journalist who managed to persuade a newspaper to publish photographs of the blood-smeared faces was arrested. Only touched-up pictures were allowed to be distributed (p255). But in a note, the author tells how the American hangmen at Landsberg did an even worse job. GIs standing underneath the gallows had to finish off the victims by stuffing cotton wool down their throats (p255ff).

The hangman, John C. Woods burned the ropes and hoods immediately after the executions, even though he had been offered $2500 for them as souvenirs (p327). He himself narrowly escaped death a few years later while testing an electric chair (p254).

Contrary to Harwood, Maser states that the bodies were not cremated in the "gas ovens" at Dachau, but at a city mortuary in Munich, and their ashes dumped into a brook running at the bottom of the yard (p13 & p256). The remaining prisoners at Nürnberg were made to clean up the blood-spattered gallows (p256).

The uncanny thing about this new book is that it originated in Germany. Anglo-American Revisionists have become so used to modern German historians running a mile from any criticism of the "Liberation" that many had almost given up hope altogether. But with the Diwald book last year, and now this magnificent work this year, the standard of historiography in the *Bundesrepublik* certainly seems to be improving.

REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT: PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON THE HOLOCAUST, Elie Wiesel (Chairman), Suite 7233, 726 Jackson Pace NW, Washington, DC 20503, 40pp, paperback. ISBN: not given.

Of the many dozens of Holocaust tracts examined by this reviewer, I thought I had become somewhat de-sensitized to the heavy ingredient of neurosis and paranoia which pervades all of

them. But on reading Mr. Wiesel's report, I must admit to a profound feeling of astonishment and shock, that the author has not been locked up in a looney-bin a long time ago. Indeed, the author himself describes some of his psychological problems in his introduction:

> Why then cling to unbearable memories that may for ever rob us of our sleep? Why not forget, turn the page, and proclaim: let it remain buried beneath the dark nightmares of our subconscious. Why not spare our children the weight of our collective burden and allow them to start their lives free of nocturnal obsessions and complexes, free of Auschwitz and its shadows?

Naturally, Mr. Wiesel goes on to explain why both he and succeeding generations should inflict upon themselves this insomnia. According to Wiesel, the survivors'

> willingness to share their knowledge, their pain, their anguish, even their agony, is motivated solely by their conviction that their survival was for a purpose. A survivor sees himself as a messenger and guardian of secrets entrusted by the dead.

A cynic might, of course, suggest that the real reason for continually shoving this lie down our throats has rather less to do with preserving epitaphs, and rather more to do with elevating modern-day Zionists above all criticism, on the spurious grounds that to criticize Zionism is to encourage another "Holocaust."

Wiesel pulls no punches in describing the "Holocaust" as an "Event" (original capitalization ... is he confusing it with the TV show of the same name?) which is "essentially Jewish." One wonders what ever happened to the five million "Others" which have been brought to the fore in Holocaust literature of late?

The Commission took nearly a year to complete its findings. It was composed of 34 members, including at least 24 Jews, some of whom claimed to themselves be "survivors." One member of the Commission was Bayard Rustin, a convicted Negro sex-pervert. The Commission travelled to eastern Europe and to Israel—they claim at their own personal expense—to examine other nations' Holocaust memorials.

They visited the site of Treblinka, which is "now wooded," and saw the Polish communist authorities' memorial representing railroad ties, charred skeletons, and a shattered menorah. The standard of aesthetics brings to mind the phoney Soviet memorial at Khatyn, which is supposed to commemorate "war dead" but is in fact a deliberate ploy to draw people's attention away from Katyn,

several hundred miles away.

The Commission went on to Auschwitz "without doubt the most lethal of all extermination camps." This will come as a surprise to Exterminationist scholars such as Gitta Sereny, who say that Auschwitz was **not** in the main an extermination camp. Later, in Warsaw, the Commission met with communist officials, and arranged for the purchase of communist war propaganda films.

The next stop was the USSR, where Commission members visited Babi Yar, in the suburbs of Kiev. Although "80,000 Jews" were killed there, the Soviet monument bore no reference to "Jews" and so "the Commission was alerted to the danger of historical falsification." Indeed! Indeed!

On to the colony of Israel where most of the Commission members must have felt really at home. They visited various Holocaust museums, including the Yad Vashem Center; and Nes Ammim, a study center run by Dutch Christians and dedicated to "atonement for the Holocaust."

Among the somewhat predictable recommendations of the Commission are that a Holocaust memorial and museum should be built and attached to the Smithsonian in Washington, DC. An Educational Foundation should be established to disseminate Holocaust propaganda to schools and colleges throughout the country. A "Committee on Conscience" to be composed of "distinguished moral leaders" should be established to advise the President on potential outbreaks of genocide anywhere in the world. (One wonders if the "distinguished moral leaders" would include in their brief Israeli atrocities against the Palestinians, Lebanese and Syrians?)

A Day of Remembrance should also be established at the end of April (which is already recognized in Israel) so that special church and synagogue services could be co-ordinated. Special liturgies and litanies have already been written, we are told.

In addition, the Commission urges the President to have the Genocide Convention passed (which would make anti-Semitism a crime); that Nazi "war criminals" be vigorously prosecuted; and that the United States interfere in foreign countries if they allow their Jewish cemeteries to sprout too many weeds.

As regards financing, the Commission suggests that Uncle Sam should start the ball rolling with one million dollars, and that the balance of the expenses should come from private subscriptions.

This short report does indeed provide a fascinating insight into Exterminationist thinking. The author will use ten words where one would have done. Adjectives and descriptions are in lists rather than in any concise form, and are drawn from the peculiar Holocaust lexicon from which all of the Exterminationist scholars

seem to draw their vocabulary. Their argot is not one of historiography, nor of any science whatsoever, but one of morbid, paranoid neurosis.

> . . . the merchant from Saloniki, the child from Lodz, the rabbi from Radzimin, the carpenter from Warsaw, and the scribe from Vilna . . .

(One wonders whatever happened to the kosher-butcher from Cracow, the banker from Bremen, and the stockmarket-speculator from Stuttgart? Weren't they "rounded up" and put on the cattle trucks also?)

> Terror-stricken families hiding in ghetto-cellars. Children running with priceless treasures: a potato or two, a crumb of bread . . . Treblinka and Ponar, Auschwitz and Babi Yar, Majdanek and Belzec . . . betrayal and torture, anxiety and loss, desperation and agony.

And, needless to say, the human devils of the "Holocaust kingdom" also committed the one crime which has been visited upon Jewish offspring with tedious repetition ever since the Romans rolled up Jewish schoolchildren (all 64 million of them, according to the Talmud) in their Torah scrolls and set fire to them:

> . . . in order to cut expenses and save gas, cost-accountant considerations led to an order to place living children directly into the ovens, or throw them into open burning pits.

Revisionism also gets a look in, in this turgid nightmare world of "charred souls . . . darkness . . . flames of darkness . . . fire . . . ashes . . . and torture" which one cannot decide bears closer resemblance to a Hieronymous Bosch painting or a Woody Allen movie:

> Little did we know that, in our lifetime, books would appear in many languages offering so-called "proof" that the Holocaust never occurred, that our parents, our friends did not die there. Little did we know that Jewish children would again be murdered, in cold blood, by killers in Israel.

The final cost-accounting for the President's Commission on the Holocaust has yet to be published. But whatever the final bill comes to, one cannot help wondering whether the money might not have been better spent on paying for an analyst for poor Mr. Wiesel. He certainly needs it.

THE HOLOCAUST VICTIMS ACCUSE, Rabbi Moshe Shonfeld, Bnei Yeshivos, 161 East Houston Street #10, New York, NY 10013, 124pp, paperback, $3.00. ISBN: not given.

The sub-title of this book is "Documents and Testimony on Jewish War Criminals." Its position on the "Holocaust" is a remarkable one.

Rabbi Shonfeld belongs to an ultra-orthodox sect of Hassidic (or Chassidic) Jews who regard the state of Israel as a blasphemy. Their view is that Israel may only be founded when the Messiah comes, and, quite obviously, neither David Ben-Gurion, nor Golda Meir, nor Menachem Begin, are the Messiah. Throughout the text, "Israel" is written in quotation marks, in a style that echoes the habit of some Revisionist scholars who insist on writing "Jews" in quotes (since most modern-day Jews are not from Judea at all, but from Khazakhstan). From time to time, the author also refers to "Eretz Yisroel."

The text of the book consists of ten indictments against various wartime Zionist leaders, who in the author's opinion, deliberately sacrificed their fellow Jews in the "Holocaust" so that the elite Jews could be granted passage to Palestine. He also condemns those loud-mouthed Zionists in the United States, who "stupidly antagonized the Nazi führer . . . by making speeches and blowing shofar in front of the German consulate . . . and by calling for a boycott of German goods." The author also apologizes for having to use the term "Holocaust" since it "has been turned into a Zionist battlecry, which we abhor, but have been forced to use for identification purposes."

The rabbi focuses on the Eichmann trial in Jerusalem, which was the first time Jewish collaboration with the Nazis was brought into the open. He condemns Romkowsky, the leader of the Zionist movement in Lodz, who became a ruthless tyrant when the Nazis put him in charge of the ghetto. A postage stamp bearing his portrait, and an inscription in Yiddish, is shown on page 23. On page 19 there is a picture of the Jewish police in the Kovna ghetto, looking every bit as sinister as the Gestapo in their black uniforms.

The author quotes the Zionist leader Chaim Weizmann, who at the 1937 Zionist Congress in London, stated that only the young Jews should go to Palestine. The aged and infirm would "have to accept their fate." Henry Montor, of the United Jewish Appeal, said the same.

He attacks the Holocaust folk-hero Abba Kovner, who sang his own praises so much on the witness stand at the Eichmann Trial

that the judges had to intervene; much to Kovner's chagrin. Contrary to the widely-held impression that Kovner was a courageous anti-Nazi partisan (and poet, to boot!) the author reveals that he was a collaborator, who handed over elderly Jews to the Nazis in order that youthful Jews—such as himself—could be granted passage to Palestine. He backs up his allegation with eye-witness evidence.

Weizmann again comes in for criticism regarding the Joel Brand affair. Brand was a Jew delegated by the Hungarian Zionists in collaboration with Eichmann to negotiate a trucks-for-Jews deal with the Allies in 1944. Weizmann, apparently, refused to see Brand when he arrived in Tel Aviv, and Brand was then arrested by the British.

Dr. Rudolf Kästner is castigated for his role in the trucks-for-Jews deal. Eichmann dressed him up in an SS uniform to take him to Belsen so that he could identify his relatives and friends, and secure their seats on the single train that would be allowed to leave. The rabbi alleges that Kästner bribed Eichmann, and that Eichmann used this money to set up home in Argentina after the war.

The starvation in the Jewish ghettos is blamed on American Zionists who picketed the depots from where food parcels were being mailed. Their placards demanded "Stop sending food to the lands of the Nazi enemy!" The author further condemns the Zionists in "Eretz Yisroel" for murdering 250 Jews on board the SS *Patria* in Haifa harbor in 1940. The idea was to blame this bombing atrocity on the British mandatory authorities.

Despite much fantasizing about the "Holocaust" this book represents an important chapter in the history of the relationship between the Nazis, the Zionists, and the Allies, which has never before been published. A 28 page review of the book is also available from a Mr. M. Qureshi at PO Box 319, Perry, OH 44081, entitled *The Great American Holocaust by Zionism* (price not known).

LESS THAN SLAVES, Benjamin B. Ferencz, Harvard University Press, 250pp, hardback, $15.00. ISBN: 0-674-52525-6.

The author of this latest Exterminationist tome will already be familiar to those Revisionists who have read Richard Harwood's masterpiece of research *Nuremberg & Other War Crimes Trials* (available from IHR at $2.50). Dealing with the American Military

Trial number 10—the Krupp trial—Harwood reveals how Ferencz was one of those "American" prosecutors who stayed on in Germany long after the dust had settled at the Nürnberg Court of "Justice."

Ferencz's task was to secure financial compensation for individual Jews around the world who felt that they had suffered some financial loss at the hands of the Nazis. But this did not prevent him vigorously lobbying against proposed clemency for the many hundreds of German "war criminals" languishing in prison; in part due to Ferencz's efforts in court.

Ferencz's latest book is based on his unique knowledge and experience; first as a prosecutor in the Krupp case, and later as director of the negotiations to secure compensation for Jewish survivors of labor camps. The remarkable thing about this book is that, although it deals almost totally with the Mill of Death itself—Auschwitz—there is hardly any mention at all of "gas chambers" or "Zyklon B" or even an "extermination program." The only mentions are on page 15, where he quotes Nürnberg document NO-365, which is an unsigned letter; pages 16-21, which rely on the notorious forgery, the Höss confessions; and on a very few other pages, where the reference to "extermination" is cursory and unreferenced.

According to the author, Jews not fit for work in the Krupp and other plants at Auschwitz would be packed off to nearby Birkenau (Brzezinka) for gassing. The camps of Belzec, Sobibor, Treblinka and Chelmno (Kulmhof-an-der-Neer) were the only camps purely for extermination. He also mentions yet another camp called Jungfernhof, near Riga in Latvia, where Jews were shipped from as far away as Austria for extermination. However, he does not attempt to explain why they were sent over 1000 miles for gassing, when they passed *en route* perfectly functional extermination camps such as Birkenau, Maidanek, Sobibor, and Treblinka, which were all reportedly in full operation, gassing Jews night and day, and belching forth smoke and ashes.

The "revised" Exterminationist view of Ferencz tallies rather closely with that of Gitta Sereny's revision of Holocaust mythology in the *New Statesman* of 2 November 1979. They both place the extermination at the four camps Chelmno, Sobibor, Treblinka and Belzec (although Ferencz adds Birkenau and the mysterious Latvian camp, Jungfernhof). Could it be that there is some collusion at work here, whereby the Exterminationist high priests have got together to get their stories straight? Perhaps they realize that the game is up, as far as Auschwitz and the Old Reich camps are concerned, and now they are trying to salvage whatever they can from the rapidly crumbling Holocaust house of cards? They have

sought refuge in the only possible corner, which is to maintain that the exterminations took place at camps which have now been obliterated without trace, and that the function of Auschwitz and the western camps was to work people to death.

Regrettably, even this position is somewhat untenable, since this very book is about all those thousands upon thousands of Jews who survived the very "horrific working conditions" which were supposed to destroy people through work! One of the most useful appendices in this very professionally laid out book is a list of claims paid to such survivors. As of the end of 1973, nearly 15,000 claimants from 42 different countries had been paid 52 million Deutschmarks. Perhaps the author's acknowledged origins in Transylvania have something to do with this vampirical campaign.

Ferencz now runs a prestigious law office in New York City which specializes in International Law. His book has already been favorably reviewed in the Communist *Daily World* (19 December 1979) and in the *New York Times Book Review* (9 December 1979); in the latter case by the discredited "historian" Martin Gilbert.

NEMESIS AT POTSDAM, Alfred M. de Zayas, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 268pp, paperback, available from IHR at $9.00. ISBN: 0-7100-9410-9.

This is a new, revised edition of this book first published in 1977. In just three years, it has become a Revisionist classic. It tells the story of the expulsion of the Germans from the eastern territories and the role played by the Anglo-Americans in that atrocity.

Over 2 million Germans did not survive the rigors of their uprooting and forced expulsion, yet the event is hardly even known outside of Germany. The text is factual and referenced; unlike the hysteria and neurosis exhibited in so many "Holocaust" tracts.

There are 7 maps, and 62 illustrations, many of which ought to be reproduced and circulated to those gullible people still taken in by the "Six Million" myth. Plate 34 shows naked German children expelled from an orphanage in Danzig, looking every bit as emaciated as any inmate of Belsen. Plates 26, 27 and 30 show refugees being transported on open goods cars; forced to leave their homelands without any of their possessions whatsoever.

Detailed appendices show formerly-secret British documents which prove that the British knew how terrible the problem was, but refused to do anything about it, for fear of upsetting our "gallant" Soviet allies.

THE HOLOCAUST, Martin Gilbert, Hill & Wang, 19 Union Square West, New York, NY 10003, 59pp, paperback, $3.45, ISBN: 0-8090-1389-4.

According to its endorser, Rabbi Marc Tannenbaum, this book

> is a perfect and convincing rejoinder to the current perverse efforts on the part of certain hostile groups and individuals to deny the reality of the massive human tragedy inflicted with particular demonism against the Jewish people by the Nazis.

Just as Rabbi Tannenbaum would not win any prizes for *précis* work in an English usage class, neither would this book win any awards for accuracy.

The author Martin Gilbert holds the prestigious position in England as official biographer of Sir Winston Churchill. Perhaps that is why the modern public holds an extremely distorted picture of this drunken chameleon who is usually regarded as a genial, avuncular, Santa Claus?

Gilbert's *Holocaust* is riddled with errors and misrepresentations. On page 47 he shows a picture of American troops liberating Belsen. If he knew anything at all about the subject he purports to be an expert in, he would know that Belsen was liberated by the British. The photo he shows is of Dachau.

On page 17, he gives the figure of "more than 40,000 dead at Dachau." Yet, a Jewish survivor of Dachau wrote in the *Los Angeles Times* (6 January 1980) that only 31,951 perished during its entire 12 years of existence. At least we should be thankful for small mercies in that Gilbert does not attempt to resurrect the long-discredited canard that inmates were gassed at Dachau.

Although the book contains many meticulously drawn maps and diagrams (which are an extremely useful tool for any Revisionist scholar) nowhere in the book can we find *any actual proof* of gassings. We see people lined up, we are told, "for gassing." We see skulls and corpses, we are again told of the "gassed." But nowhere is there a photo of people being herded into, or standing in, a "gas chamber." We don't even get a picture of the alleged "gas chamber" which is today shown to visitors at the Auschwitz museum.

Ironically, it falls to a fellow Exterminationist to have the final word in reviewing Mr. Gilbert's historical abilities. In a startling four-page article in the London *New Statesman* (2 November 1979) Ms. Gitta Sereny ("mother-confessor" of Franz Stangl) pans the otherwise "reputable historian."

She tells how Gilbert has been taken in by survivor testimonies and films (!) which "were only partly true, or even were partly faked." She goes on to show how Gilbert was duped into making all kinds of incorrect assertions about Treblinka, because he believed the word of notorious hoaxters such as Jean Francois Steiner and Martin Gray. Ms. Sereny even indicates that she herself was approached to help ghost write the Treblinka experiences of Gray, who "had manifestly never been" there.

Martin Gilbert was a graduate of, and is now a professor of history at, Oxford University. This book certainly says a lot about the standards of excellence throughout the British "Ivy League."

AMERICAN MANIFEST DESTINY AND THE HOLOCAUSTS, Conrad Grieb (editor), Examiner Books, PO Box 783, New York City, NY 10022, 380pp, paperback, $8.00. ISBN: not given.

This remarkable collection of documents represents an essential archive for any scholar wishing to investigate the other "Holocausts." There are reprints from *The American Mercury, The Spotlight, Blasting the Historical Blackout, The New York Times, Congressional Record,* and many less well known organs. The materials are fully indexed and referenced.

THE BARNES TRILOGY, Harry Elmer Barnes, Institute for Historical Review, 144pp, paperback, $4.00. ISBN: 0-911038-56-6.

This is a new reprint of three of Barnes' last pamphlets, where one can trace his development as a full-fledged, out-of-the closet, Historical Revisionist. Of course, this is not the first time these pamphlets have been published in a collection. In 1972 Arno Press (part of the *New York Times* group) published a collection of eight of his pamphlets including these same three. The Arno title, *Selected Revisionist Pamphlets* (also available from IHR at $15.00), has several shortcomings, which hopefully the new *Barnes Trilogy* will put to rights.

First, the IHR book is a much better value than the Arno edition, and can thus be distributed to a much wider audience. Second, the pamphlets are in chronological order in IHR's book, but not in Arno's. Third, IHR provides a detailed and factual introduction, by IHR Chief Lewis Brandon, which guides the reader through Barnes' work, drawing attention to important features. The reader of Arno

is left to fend for himself. Finally, the IHR edition shows dates of publication, which Arno omits altogether.

In summary, it would seem that the shoestring Institute for Historical Review can teach a few publishing lessons to even the grandest of Madison Avenue outfits.

DEALING IN HATE, Dr. Michael F. Connors, Institute for Historical Review, 40pp, paperback, $2.50. ISBN: 0-911038-55-8.

This new booklet is an excellent introduction for any student of black propaganda. The author argues that we have been deliberately manipulated into a "hate Germany" attitude, and led to believe that the Huns are much more prone to warfare than any other nation. He logs the outbreaks of warfare over the past century, and shows that Germany has committed far fewer acts of aggression than her European neighbors.

He examines the manipulation of public opinion through the invention of atrocity rumors and shows how some of the canards—such as the famous "soap factory" yarn—were actually recycled during WWII, even after they had been exposed after the end of WWI!

He concludes by giving a few examples of the hysterical, anti-German outbursts which have emanated from Zionist sources, and censures those authors such as Shirer who still continue in this neurotic vendetta.

Although the book was written and first published in 1962, it remains as fresh as ever in this new edition, with an eye-catching, graphic cover. One should go on from here and read *The First Casualty* by Phillip Knightly ($14.50 from IHR) and *Falsehood in Wartime* by Arthur Ponsonby (IHR, $4.00).

ASSAULT ON THE LIBERTY, James M. Ennes, Jr., Random House, 300pp, hardback, available from IHR at $14.00. ISBN: 0-394-50512-3.

Subtitled "The True Story of the Israeli Attack on an American Intelligence Ship," this book must certainly carry much more clout

than its predecessor: It was written by a crew member.

Ennes was a cryptological officer on board the USS *Liberty* when it was attacked and 34 of its crew killed by Israeli marines in 1967. Ennes was aghast that the whole affair should be hushed up and that the American government should meekly accept the Israelis' lies. He felt it his duty to his 34 murdered comrades that the truth should be told. Consequently, he set about the arduous task of interviewing dozens of officials, and collating hundreds of documents. Many times he was warned to drop the subject.

It was not until he finally left the service in 1978 that he could speak freely. This book is the result. It is packed with details and first-hand accounts. This book truly is "survivor testimony."

There is such attention to detail here that it puts to shame the one previous work on this subject, *Conspiracy of Silence*, by journalist Anthony Pearson (available from IHR at $11.00). Although Ennes does not mention the previous book by name, he does have a few scathing comments for those who speculate on fantastic, impossible devices which would intercept and scramble radio messages before re-transmitting them.

ROOSEVELT, CHURCHILL & THE WORLD WAR TWO OPPOSITION, George T. Eggleston, Devin-Adair, 256pp, hardback, available from IHR at $14.00. ISBN: 0-8159-5311-9.

When the war clouds gathered over Europe in the late 1930's, George T. Eggleston, along with Col. Charles Lindbergh, John Marquand and others, was determined that we should not become involved in the second "War-to-end-all-Wars." He became editor-in-chief of a new magazine, *Scribner's Commentator*, dedicated to keeping America out. The fact that more than 80% of the American people were opposed to our entering the war helped make the publication an instant success. This success, and the growing influence of the America First movement generally, was not lost on Franklin D. Roosevelt and the others who were determined to involve the United States.

Roosevelt, Churchill, and The World War Two Opposition is the story of Eggleston's efforts to keep us out of the war and what happened to him as a result. "An amazing expose of harassment by the U.S. Government," writes DeWitt Wallace, founding editor of *Reader's Digest*. "The story needs to be told as an example of what has happened in the U.S.A. and what could happen again."

ABOUT THE CONTRIBUTORS

Dr. Robert Faurisson was born at Shepperton, near London, in 1929, to a French father and a Scottish mother. He was educated in Singapore, Japan, Marseille, and in Paris at the Sorbonne, where he received his doctorate in 1972. After a short spell teaching at the Sorbonne, Professor Faurisson became Associate Professor in French Literature at the University of Lyon-2 in central France. He specializes in the appraisal and evaluation of texts and documents.

Ditlieb Felderer is one of four refugee children who were all born in different European countries. He himself was born in Innsbruck, Austria, in 1942. The family eventually found refuge in Sweden, where Mr. Felderer now lives with his Filipino wife. In 1959, Mr. Felderer became converted to the Jehovah's Witnesses faith, and went on extensive evangelizing tours of North America. He first became interested in the "Holocaust" when researching an article on the treatment of the Jehovah's Witnesses during the war. After comparing the Exterminationist and Revisionist views, he was at once converted to the latter. He now runs his own magazine and publishing house *Bible Researcher*, and organizes Revisionist tours of Poland every summer.

Otto Kanold runs a West Berlin advertising agency for the transportation and shipping industry.

Mark Weber was born and raised in Oregon. After graduating from Jesuit High School, he lived and worked in Bonn, Germany, and in Kumasi, Ghana, in order to broaden his experience. His higher education was at various universities around the world: Portland State University; University of Illinois, Chicago; University of Munich, Germany; and Portland State U. again. He graduated with high honors in 1976 with a BA in history. Receiving laudatory recommendations from a number of professors, he was offered several scholarships for post-graduate study. He received a full fellowship from Indiana University at Bloomington, and received his MA in central European history in December 1977.

John Bennett is a 42 year old Australian lawyer. He graduated in law with honors from the University of Melbourne in 1958, and in arts with honors in 1966. Since 1968 he has worked in the Public Defender's office of the federal Australian government in Melbourne. Since 1966 he has been Secretary of the Victorian Council for Civil Liberties, and is the author of several best-selling booklets on that subject. In 1968 he was expelled from

the Victoria chapter of the Australian Labor Party, for calling for federal investigation into the way it was run. Three years later federal intervention took place. John Bennett is Australian representative for the Institute for Historical Review.

Richard Harwood is a graduate of the University of London, and is the author of two Revisionist classics: *Six Million Lost & Found* and *The Nuremberg & Other War Crimes Trials: A New Look.*

Lewis Brandon is the full-time Director of the Institute for Historical Review in Torrance, near Los Angeles, California. Besides the signed articles, he also reviewed all of the books.

Arthur Ponsonby was born in 1871 and was a great-grandson of Earl Grey, the British Prime Minister. Ponsonby served with the British Diplomatic Service in Constantinople and Copenhagen, before returning to a desk job at the Foreign Office in Whitehall. He then became principal private secretary to Prime Minister Campbell-Bannerman. He was elected a Liberal Member of Parliament himself in 1908, but switched to the Labor Party in 1922. He was elevated to the House of Lords in 1930 as Lord Ponsonby of Shulbrede. For four years he was leader of the Opposition in the Lords. He wrote a score of books on various subjects, the most famous of which is *Falsehood in Wartime*, which was published in 1928, and has now been republished by the IHR. This article is extracted therefrom. Lord Ponsonby died in 1946.

Harry Elmer Barnes (1889-1968) is generally regarded as the founding father of Historical Revisionism. The first-ever Revisionist Convention in 1979 was dedicated to his memory. He authored scores of books and hundreds of articles, which take up **forty-seven** pages of listings in his biography. The best introduction to his writings is *The Barnes Trilogy* (IHR, 1979, $4). This article is extracted from *The Freethinker*, a San Diego based atheist newsletter.

SECOND ANNUAL CONVENTION

1980 Revisionist Convention

1-3 August 1980

near Ontario International Airport
California, U.S.A.

Preliminary schedule includes papers by distinguished international scholars on:

- Rafael Lemkin and the origins of the term "genocide"
- The Waffen-SS and the Malmedy "Massacre" and "Trial"
- Hitler's knowledge of the "Final Solution"
- Auschwitz in slides
- Subhas Chandra Bose and the Indian National Army
- An oral Revisionist Bibliography

Price

$150 (includes meals and accommodation)
$75 (commuter fee: meals only)
Half price for bona-fide students.
A limited number of free scholarships are available.

For application form, send SASE to:
Institute for Historical Review
P.O. Box 1306
Torrance, California 90505